MISPERCEPTIONS OF FRIENDLY AND SEXUAL CUES: THE EFFECTS OF GENDER AND SITUATION

by

Michael P. Heck

B.S., Frostburg State College, 1983

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Psychology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1987

Approved by:

William Griffitt

Major Professor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A11207 307161

List of Tables..... ii

Acknowledgements.....iii

Introduction..... 1

Hypotheses..... 26

Methods..... 28

  Subjects..... 28

  Materials..... 29

  Tape Conditions..... 30

  Procedure..... 33

  Proposed Analyses..... 34

Results..... 36

  Manipulation Check..... 36

  Preliminary Study..... 38

  Reliability Analyses..... 42

  Factor Analyses..... 43

  Repeated Measures Analyses..... 53

Discussion..... 55

References..... 82

Tables..... 88

Appendices.....110

Glossary of Alternative Phrases.....120

LIST OF TABLES

Table:

Page #

1. Manipulation Check Results..... 88

2. Preliminary Study Results..... 89
[Mean Ratings of Actors]

3. Preliminary Study Results..... 91
[Sex of Actor Effect]

4. Factor Analyses of Dependent Measures..... 93
[Male Actor]

5. Factor Analyses of Dependent Measures..... 94
[Female Actor]

6. Analyses of Dependent Measures..... 95
[Male Actor]

6A. Summary of Main Effects..... 99
[Male Actor]

7. Analyses of Dependent Measures.....100
[Female Actor]

7A. Summary of Main Effects.....103
[Female Actor]

8. Intent Survey Summary.....104

9. Repeated Measures Analyses.....106
[Sex of Actor Effect]

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This manuscript represents the insights and suggestions of a great many people. Although time does not permit for me to mention each one individually, I would like to extend my appreciation to a select few. First, I would like to thank my major advisor, William Griffitt, for his patience, wisdom, and guidance over the past few years. At the very least, his insights helped mold an abstract idea into a concrete, workable project. Furthermore, I would also like to thank my committee members, Leon Rappoport and Frank Saal. Their suggestions and comments were invaluable in helping me understand and interpret the implications and extentions of this project.

Throughout my graduate career I was fortunate enough to have a close, supportive network of friends. I would like to take this opportunity to thank those who became involved in my work; namely, Laura King, Lawrence Schoen, Cathy Johnson, and Logan Martin. In their own way, each of them helped me through various stages of this project. Hopefully I have been as supportive of their work as they have of mine.

I would also like to thank Chrismarie Baxter, my undergraduate advisor and close friend. During those formative years when I had doubts about obtaining an advance degree, her advice helped me make the critical decision to attend graduate school. Moreover, her friendship throughout these past few years has comforted me greatly.

Although often overlooked, and seldom receiving praise, I am deeply indebted to my parents, Elizabeth and Joseph Heck. Their love and devotion as well as belief in my abilities has been a guiding force in my life for the past twenty-seven years.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my wife, Margaret Stockdale. There were too many times when I wanted to give up on this project in search of easier, more enjoyable pursuits. Her love and support helped me through these troubling and trying times.

MISPERCEPTIONS OF FRIENDLY AND SEXUAL CUES: THE EFFECTS OF GENDER AND SITUATIONS

In our society, there has been a general inability to effectively handle problems of a sensitive social nature. These issues include, but are not limited to, sexual violence towards women, rape, date rape, child molestation, and sexual harassment. Recently however, there has been a consciousness-raising effort to increase our awareness of these problems, with the greatest impetus coming from the various media. Documentaries, news coverages, journal publications, and dramatic retellings of true stories have indeed raised the general public's awareness of problems in our society that are of a sexual nature. Ironically though, the media have exploited sex and violence for profit-making motives to the point where some researchers (c.f. Eron, 1980; Malamuth & Check, 1981; Malamuth & Donnerstein, 1982; Thomas, Horton, Lippencott, & Drabman, 1977) have argued that society has become desensitized to the magnitude and severity of these social ills. These researchers pointed out that a selective, but substantial proportion of today's media (eg. television, movies and newsprint) have

manipulated the perceptions society holds of women by inappropriately portraying them in situations or roles that are degrading and dehumanizing to their gender.

Specifically, it has been argued that many of these portrayals are variations of a central theme that suggests that, along with being considered subservient to men, women should be viewed as passive, lifeless mannequins whose only redeeming qualities consist of catering to the needs of men (Longino, 1980). Implicit in much of this media message is the sensationalizing of the idea that, in addition to being exploited sexually, women can serve as an outlet for men to vent their anger and frustration. Thus, women have been depicted and perceived as being sexual objects who, when aggressed against, enjoy being treated in this manner.

The assumption made in this paper is that the desensitization caused by the various media, and the confusion raised by increased awareness of violent or sexual acts directed towards women, may be contributing to the distortion of perceptions of everyday social interactions. This study intended to show that men and women perceive various dyadic social interactions in different ways such that women will view the behaviors

of the man and woman as being friendly in nature while men will view these same interactions as being more sexually toned. The existing literature on social interactions, pornography desensitization, and male/female socialization processes should provide a framework in which to discuss possible explanations for the perceptual differences that may exist between the sexes.

Evidence that the images that are being fostered through the media regarding women are having an impact on the perceptions individuals form, especially men, can be noticed when reviewing the date rape literature. According to Russell (1975), misunderstandings concerning cultural beliefs about a dating situation can lead to, in extreme cases, date rape. A common theme present in most rape scenarios involves a man entering a dating situation eagerly looking for signs that would validate his sexual advances. When he attempts such an encounter, but misperceives the women's cues, he chooses to resort to forceful acts such as rape to compensate for his bewildered feelings. Conservative estimates on date and acquaintance rape indicate that sixty-five percent of all rape cases reported involve the victim knowing her assailant (Katz

& Mazur, 1979). Kanin and Parcell (1977) found that over fifty percent of the female undergraduates they surveyed reported experiencing varying levels of sexual aggression directed toward them while involved in a dating situation. Similarly, Goodchilds and Zellman (1984) found that the impact of these misperceptions is widespread in that even younger segments of our population have been influenced by their effects. Seventy-nine percent of the adolescents they polled, for instance, reported that it would be acceptable in certain situations for a male to force sexual intercourse upon a female if the situation included one or more of the following:

> "(1) he spends a lot of money on her; (2) he's so turned on that he can't stop; (3) she is stoned or drunk; (4) she has had sexual intercourse with other guys; (5) she lets him touch her above the waist; (6) she says she is going to have sex with him and then changes her mind; (7) they have been dating a long time, (8) she got him sexually excited" (p. 241).

An obvious explanation for the attitudes cited in this research is that both men and women have been

socialized to believe that sexual aggression against women is an acceptable form of behavior under some circumstances. More importantly, this socialization process has transcended age and fostered a normative attitude among adult as well as adolescent men that suggests that when women say "no" in actuality they mean "yes" (Griffitt, 1987). This type of belief, according to Griffitt, has prompted men to develop attitudes such that they believe they need to be more persistent in their sexual endeavors. These apparent differences between the sexes have created a situation in which different perceptions and expectancies are encountered within a situation containing sexual cues. Gagnon and Simon (1973) have argued that these perceptions and expectancies create two distinct sets of social "scripts" for the sexes. That is, men develop a script that encourages them to be aggressive and persistent in the initiation of sexual acts and to believe that their image as a male is contingent upon their sexual conquests. Women, on the other hand, have been encouraged to develop "feminine" characteristics such as subservience and emotionality and to follow a script that suggests that they be sexually passive and reserved while maintaining control over their bodies as

well as the sexual act (Goodchilds & Zellman, 1984; Griffitt, 1987).

To the extent that men hold these attitudes about women, it is important to ask what are the possible ramifications of these attitudes in normal social interactions. If men perceive casual interactions as more sexual than women, then this may have implications for explaining more serious problems in society such as date and acquaintance rape as well as sexual harassment. This question was initially raised by Abbey (1982), who sought to determine whether men perceived normal social interactions involving a man and woman as being more sexually toned than do women. Abbey reported a study by Hendrick (1976) in which the perceptions of date rape were experimentally examined. Subjects viewed a videotape of a interaction between a man and a woman which concluded with the man asking the woman for a date and her acceptance. The subjects were then told that the date ended with the couple at the woman's apartment engaging in sexual intercourse against the woman's wishes. Important sex differences were found in the subjects' interpretations of this scenario. Men rated the female actor as more attractive and more promiscuous than did women. Men

also believed that the female actor really did not mean "no," and if she did, she was considered to be at fault for allowing the sexual act to occur.

One of the most interesting findings of this study, however, was that the male observers rated the male actor higher in terms of sexual attributes (eg. attractiveness, promiscuity, and provocativeness) than did the female observers. This led Hendrick to conclude that men and women have varying perceptions concerning each other's sexual intentions in regard to social interactions; men seem more at ease in ascribing higher mean values to the sexually relevant attributes.

Abbey (1982) extended this research by investigating the perceptions of men and women in non-dating interactions. Intuitively, it can be seen how cues in a dating situation might be misperceived by members of both sexes. That is, romantic involvement can at times cloud peoples' perceptions of a given situation and therefore cause them to misinterpret the signals being given by their partner. Nowhere are these misperceptions more likely to occur than in situations which contain an element of sexual intrigue. Abbey, however, was mainly interested in evaluating whether these misperceptions were evident in friendly

types of interactions between individuals who were meeting for the first time. She hypothesized that men, more than women, would misperceive the friendly cues in the situation as being a sign of sexual interest, and would therefore be more willing to act upon these cues through their ratings of the situation. She attributed the cause of this difference between the sexes to a manifestation of an overall male sexual orientation.

To investigate this gender difference, Abbey recruited undergraduates from a general psychology class. She randomly divided these subjects into groups of four, each group consisting of two men and two women. She then assigned each pair to either an actor or observer condition. Within this design, Abbey had the male and female actors improvise a five-minute skit while allowing for the observers to view the interaction unobtrusively through a one-way mirror. Abbey was concerned with the perceptions that were being formed by both the actors and observers. She measured these perceptions by having each group complete a series of questionnaires concerning the social interaction that took place between the male and female actors. Abbey used three terms that were considered dependent measures. These terms were

"seductive," "promiscuous," and "flirtatious," and each of them was embedded within a fifteen-item questionnaire. These key terms were selected under the premise that they each contained sexually suggestive meanings. Since Abbey's primary hypothesis was that men would perceive the situation as being more sexual than would women, the use of sexually connotative terms seemed an appropriate way to assess this difference.

The results indicated that there was a consistent sex-of-subject effect regarding two of the key terms, promiscuous and seductive. Specifically, men rated both the male and female actors as being more promiscuous and seductive than did women. In addition to a sex-of-subject effect, there was also a main effect of sex-of-actor, suggesting that the female actor was consistently rated higher than the male actor. A third finding of this study was that men were more willing to act upon their perceptions than women in that they reported significantly higher mean ratings on questions such as "Would you like to get to know your partner better?"; "Would you be interested in becoming friends with your partner?"; or "Are you sexually attracted to your partner?". Each of these questions was directed at the opposite sex actor.

Therefore, male actors and observers rated the female actor, while female actors and observers rated the male actor.

Abbey concluded that men were more likely than women to perceive their world in sexual terms. Furthermore, she stated that men had a tendency to misperceive friendliness cues from a women as being a sign of sexual interest. This misperception, according to Abbey, lends support to a partial explanation of situations in which date rape as well as acquaintance rape have taken place. That is, within each of the situations, circumstances arise in which men may misperceive various social cues from women as a sign of sexual interest. Men believe that their perceptions are an accurate assessment of the situation, and therefore proceed to act upon them. It is the misperception of these cues that is of primary importance to Abbey, since men believe that their actions in these types of situations are warranted.

The implications of Abbey's study prompted investigation into whether or not these gender differences could be reproduced in the work environment, (Saal & Freshnock, 1986) as well as in an academic setting (Johnson, Freshnock, & Saal 1986).

Each of these studies sought to determine, in one way or another, the extent to which men's misperceptions of women's cues could be extended to situations which involve the implicit or explicit use of sexual aggression against women. Saal and Freshnock (1986), however, reasoned that a replication of Abbey's findings was needed prior to addressing the sexual agression issues. They ran a similar design using the actor and observer conditions along with the three key dependent measures in an attempt to validate Abbey's generalizations. Their results supported Abbey's findings in that there was a main effect of sex-of-subject and sex-of-actor. This implied that men were rating the actors higher in sexual attributes than were women, and that the female actor was always rated higher on the three key terms than was her male counterpart. In addition, men reported more willingness to meet or date the opposite sex-actors.

Saal and Freshnock (1986) contended that if men and women perceived friendly (innocuous) situations differently, perhaps this misperception would carry over into a work environment. They hypothesized that within a work situation, where social interactions between members of the opposite sex continually take

place, men are much more likely to perceive greater sexual overtones in the situation than are women. Saal and Freshnock believed that if these same misperceptions were evident in the work place, then perhaps the findings of Abbey's study could be used as a cornerstone for a theoretical framework on sexual harassment. That is, sexual harassment may be a situation in which various social cues are being perceived as sexual. Sexual harassment has been defined as "annoying behaviors that are sexually motivated, or which carry sexually offensive meanings or intentions, or which the victim suffers because of her or his sex" (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1980). Since men tend to be the main perpetrators of such harassing acts, these investigators suggested that the misperceptions of social cues by men may be a contributing factor in their overt behavior.

In their work environment study, Saal and Freshnock (1986) recruited male and female undergraduate students and had them view a twelve-minute videotape of a male employer and a female employee interacting. Subjects' mean ratings on a 7-point scale were obtained. The three key terms used by Abbey were also used in this

study, along with the addition of another term, "sexy". Their results showed that a main effect of sex-of-subject was evident throughout the study with respect to the four key terms, indicating that men rated both male and female actors as trying to be more sexy, flirtatious, promiscuous, and seductive. In addition, there was a sex-of-actor effect such that the female employee was always rated higher on these sexual terms than was the male employer. Also, men were more willing to act upon their perceptions than were women, as indicated by their mean responses to question such as "Would you be willing to date the opposite-sex actor?" or "Are you sexually attracted to the opposite-sex actor?".

Saal and Freshnock (1986) concluded that a consistent and convincing gender difference existed in situations where a man and woman interact socially. Furthermore, they believed that with respect to the work environment, men were more likely than women to view various interactions between co-workers as being sexual in nature. This apparent misperception, according Saal and Freshnock, merits further consideration in trying to understand the behavior of men who "use sexuality as a vehicle for communicating

with or dominating women in organizations" (p. 3).

Research examining sexual attitudes, attributions, and perceptions has indicated that within the past twenty years there has been a major shift in societal values concerning the depiction of sexually aggressive and violent acts directed towards women (Donnerstein, 1984; Howitt, 1982; Malamuth, 1984; Medea & Thompson, 1974). Whereas in previous years such depictions would have been considered a social taboo, in recent years they have been tolerated, if not encouraged by mainstream society (Donnerstein, 1984; Malamuth, 1984). Opponents of pornography reason that the negative change in today's value system regarding women can be attributed directly to the influence of sexually provocative, pornographic, and violent materials being exploited through the mass media (Brownmiller, 1975; Eysenck & Nias, 1978; Stienem, 1980). Specifically, these authors contend that the proliferation of sexually explicit materials has produced an anti-female climate in which the incidence of sexually callous attitudes toward and perceptions of women has become greater. Moreover, this proliferation of erotic/pornographic materials has had its greatest impact on the perceptions men hold of women. It has

created an environment in which the subservience of women has been the norm, thereby allowing men to view women in a more sexually degrading manner (Eysenck & Nias, 1978). That is, much of this material portrays women in unequal power/sexual relationships with their male counterparts who, in effect, are able to force/coerce them into submission. Women have been depicted as desiring sexual gratification, while men have been led to believe that they can fulfill that desire. One of the serious repercussions from the increase of sexually explicit materials has been that it has served to reinforce this perception.

Although depicting degradation of women by men has been a common technique designed to capture, arouse, and hold the attention of a male audience, Howitt (1982) maintained that this type of sexual ploy has had disastrous consequences for society. He pointed out that the underlying themes present in many of these portrayals have made it extremely hard for men to distinguish between the fiction being depicted and the reality that is confronted in everyday life. This inability to distinguish between the two dimensions has contributed greatly to the increase of distorted sex role stereotypes by encouraging men to view women

primarily as sex objects rather than equal status counterparts (Schaffer, 1981).

According to Donnerstein and Hallam (1978), the increased availability of erotic/pornographic materials has had a more noticeable impact on the negative perceptions men form of women. These authors contended that, as long as women have been characterized by the media as sexual objects, the increased availability of erotic/pornographic materials has served only to intensify and perpetuate those negative perceptions. Eysenck and Nias (1978) noted that these perceptions have not only become a recognized and accepted component of our culture, but the increased availability of sexually oriented materials has served to stabilize these perceptions. Critics are fearful of this trend, since current research has indicated that even limited exposure to such material can have a dramatic effect on the perceptions an individual holds toward the people being portrayed (Byrne & Kelly, 1984; Malamuth & Donnerstein, 1982; Zillman & Bryant, 1984).

As previously mentioned, the media have been implicated as a major contributor to the perceptions men hold toward women. Much of this logic stems from the fact that the media act not only as a mirror,

reflecting the values and cultural beliefs of a society, but also play an instrumental role in shaping and influencing those values and beliefs. By attempting to romanticize aggression against women for instance, the media have set a dangerous precedent by fostering a situation in which the aggressive act becomes a socially accepted practice (Donnerstein, 1980; Donnerstein & Hallam, 1978). Malamuth (1984) attempted to explore aggression against women from a cultural perspective and concluded that the mass media are by far among the more influential factors in the perceptions men form regarding women. Each of these areas, for instance, has in one form or another conditioned men into believing that it is socially acceptable behavior to "slap a woman down" if the situation warrants such an action. Similarly, women are conditioned to believe that if a man has aggressed against them, then they must have done something to prompt that type of behavior.

Attitudes like these, according to Schaffer (1981), tend to be by-products of the environment as well as the type of socialization process to which an individual is exposed. Society intervenes in this socialization process by sending signals to both men

and women (eg. through the media) that suggest that it is acceptable behavior to treat women in aggressive/sexual ways. Subsequently, a natural progression of these attitudes is that they filter into situations where men and women interact socially.

The position that exposure to erotic/pornographic materials influences individuals' perceptions has received considerable attention in the past two decades. Although many have argued for the possible negative social ramifications of such exposure, (c.f. Howitt, 1982; Lederer, 1980; Malamuth & Donnerstein, 1982) the position has not gone unchallenged. For instance, a fierce debate between members of a senate sub-committee prompted a 1967 Commission on Obscenity and Pornography to conduct a three-year investigation examining the effects of sexually explicit materials and their influence on society. A vast amount of information, characteristic of most senate sub-committees, was assembled over this time period. Information ranging from expert witnesses to historically based literature reviews to experimentally based studies was used to determine the impact sexually explicit materials were having on individuals' perceptions. It was the commission's opinion that,

based on the available evidence (i.e., no discernible effects), there was no research that linked antisocial effects (e.g., rape, violence, etc.) to either the availability of, or exposure to, pornographic material (Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, 1970).

In recent years, however, the commission's findings have come under a considerable amount of criticism. Although current research investigating the relationship between erotica/pornography and sexual aggression has cited conflicting results, the vast majority of these studies agree that this type of material is a potent generator of negative perceptions of women (Byrne & Kelly, 1984; Malamuth, 1981; Malamuth & Donnererstein, 1982; Sapolsky, 1984). Even though a man will not consciously aggress against, or rape a woman after viewing pornographic material, a strong possibility exists that the individual's perceptions concerning women may be altered with prolonged exposure (Zillman & Bryant, 1984).

The question at hand is not whether sexually explicit/pornographic material will alter overt behavior, but rather the impact it will have on an individual's perceptions over a period of time. Experimental research investigating sexually aggressive

pornography has indicated that viewers of pornography are more likely than non-viewers to interpret the female portrayals as suggesting that women enjoy being treated in an aggressive, somewhat violent manner (Donnerstein, 1984; Malamuth 1984). In a study designed to measure attitudes concerning sexually aggressive acts directed at women, Malamuth and Check (1981) noted that men were more accepting of rape myths and violence toward women after they viewed commercially released films that portrayed aggression against women than were men who were not exposed to the experimental manipulations (e.g., sexually aggressive films).

Donnerstein and Linz (1984) have noted a similar effect in that subjects they exposed to massive amounts of sexually explicit/violent types of materials not only developed more casual attitudes concerning aggression against women, but also attributed more blame to the woman when asked to evaluate the reenactment of a rape trial. These perceptions, according to the authors, have created serious repercussions for society by becoming so distorted and commonplace that individuals respond to actual rape/violent situations as being trivial in comparison

to what they have been exposed to through the media.

It should be pointed out that the ability of the media to influence the perceptions individuals form of one another extends beyond the realm of pornographic/violent materials. Donnerstein (1984) pointed out that pornography in general is not what influences aggression against women; it is the ways in which women are depicted through pornography as well as other areas of the media that are of primary concern. Moreover, Malamuth (1984) has argued that the highly pornographic film may not be perceived as being more realistic than an "R" rated film, since many of these "R" rated films depict more subtle, believable, types of sexual cues. These subtle types of sexual cues are accepted more readily by individuals because they often tend to assimilate the type of reality the viewer is experiencing. In fact, Malamuth has raised the question of whether these subtle types of sexual stimuli are more detrimental to society than blatant types of stimuli, given the fact that the media as a whole tends to portray more of the subtle sexual stimuli.

A current extension of the Abbey (1982) and Saal and Freshnock (1986) studies, in which the

misperceptions of men were experimentally examined in an academic setting, was developed by Johnson, Freshnock, and Saal (1986). These investigators recruited male and female undergraduates to view a videotape depicting a male professor and a female student engaging in a conversation. In this tape condition the professor and student were discussing the possibility of extending the deadline for the student's term paper. Subjects rated the male and female actors on a 7-point rating scale intended to assess their "sexuality-based" perceptions. This scale integrated the four key dependent measures that were used by Saal and Freshnock (1986). In addition to this task, subjects were instructed to evaluate, on a similar scale, the level of "friendship," "sexual attractiveness," and "dating potential" that was being portrayed between the professor and the student.

The results of this study were consistent with those obtained by Abbey (1982) and Saal and Freshnock (1986). A consistent sex-of-subject, as well as a sex-of-actor effect was evident. This suggested that the men perceived the professor/student interaction as being more sexually toned than did women, and that the female student was rated higher in terms of sexual

intentions than was the male professor. Women, on the other hand, were more inclined than men to see the professor/student interaction as being friendly in nature instead of sexually oriented. Johnson, Freshnock, and Saal (1986) concluded that the results of this study support the claim that men do indeed view their world in more sexual terms than women. Furthermore, this apparent difference between the sexes has now been substantiated in a variety of situations in which men and women interact socially.

The Abbey (1982) study has raised our awareness of the differences that exist between the perceptions men and women form with regard to social interactions. As she pointed out, men tend to read sexual intent into friendly behavior, and this process seems to be attributable to a general bias on behalf of men concerning the intentions of women. Women, according to this study, are not as likely to misperceive the intentions of men in the same way that men misjudge women's. Although these interpretations may have seemed obvious to Abbey, it should be noted that the interpretation of Abbey's results was somewhat misleading. She indicated that men (actors and observers) tended to rate the interaction as being more

sexual than women (actors or observers). Women on the other hand, rated the same interactions as being more friendly than men. Inspection of the mean ratings of the perceptions of the interactions, however, indicated that although there was a reliable difference between group ratings, men rated the interaction only slightly less friendly than women. Similarly, Saal and Freshnock (1986) along with Johnson, Freshnock, and Saal (1986) obtained results that agreed with Abbey's, except that the polarity of their scales was reversed (i.e. higher mean ratings indicated higher levels of friendliness). Abbey interpreted her differences as being indicative of men viewing the interaction between themselves and their female counterparts as sexual. Saal and Freshnock (1986) and Johnson, Freshnock, and Saal (1986) noted this interpretation in the discussion of their results, and pointed out this discrepancy in the interpretation of Abbey's results. That is, these investigators concluded that although men as a group did not necessarily rate the interaction as sexual, as indicated by the mean ratings, they did perceive it to be less friendly than women.

The proposed study aims to reexamine this perceptual difference between men and women with

respect to how they view various social interactions. The study is intended not to be merely a replication of the earlier research, but to add to our understanding of how these attitudes and biases are developed. While the past research of Abbey (1982), Saal and Freshnock (1986), and Johnson, Freshnock, and Saal (1986) has examined men's misperceptions of friendly behavior in various situations, the present study extends this investigation by determining the perceptions men and women form of sexually toned behavior. This additional factor is intended to relate Abbey's innocuous situation to Hendrick's (1976) sexual scenario. The studies mentioned above have made the assumption that misperceptions of friendly interactions are antecedents to misbehavior in sexual situations. This study is intended to shed light on whether this conceptual leap can be supported. If the perceptions men form concerning women's behavior are found to be markedly different (i.e., sexual) than the perceptions women form, this finding may lend further evidence for the underlying causes of sexual violence toward women (e.g., rape, sexual harassment). Moreover, the possible misinterpretation by Abbey about her mean differences may be made clearer by examining the

perceptions both men and women form concerning the sexually toned scenarios. Additional support for Abbey's initial premise would be gained if a perceptual difference (bias) between the sexes carries over to these scenarios.

Hypotheses

1. Men will generally rate both male and female actors as more sexual, flirtatious, promiscuous, and seductive than will women. This hypothesis is consistent with the findings of Abbey (1982), Saal and Freshnock (1986) and Johnson, Freshnock, and Saal (1986) that have consistently found main effects of sex-of-subject.

2. Female actors will be rated as more sexual, flirtatious, promiscuous, and seductive than male actors. This hypothesis is supported by the research of Abbey and Saal and his associates that have determined that these dependent measures are generally attributed to women more than men, regardless of the situational context.

3. Subjects will rate the actors in the sexual scenarios as more sexual, flirtatious, promiscuous, and seductive than subjects in the friendly scenario. Although no previous research has looked at both sexual

and friendly situations, this hypothesis is based on logic, and also serves as a manipulation check that the scenes could truly be distinguished.

4. There will be a two-way interaction between sex-of-subject and type of situation. Men and women subjects will differ in their perceptions of friendly situations, as has been found in past research. However, it is predicted that this difference will become more pronounced in the sexually-toned scenarios. This prediction is not directly based on specific past research, but draws on the pornography and sexual violence toward women literature (cf. Donnerstein, 1984; Eysenck & Nias, 1978; Katz & Mazur, 1979; Malamuth, 1984). It is expected that the men will perceive the sexually toned scenario as legitimizing their sexual drives, and therefore will act upon these perceptions through their ratings of the situation. That is, much of the research dealing with this issue has cited that pornography intensifies perceptions of women deriving pleasure from these types of scenes. Since the primary audience of pornography are men, the mere suggestion of sexuality in the sexual conditions portrayed by this study should enhance men's perception of sexual cues. Women are expected to perceive more

sexuality in the actors in the sexually-toned scenes than the friendly scene, but not to as great an extent as men.

Method

Subjects

Two hundred undergraduates from Kansas State University were recruited to participate in this study. Subjects were randomly assigned to one of three tape conditions. Each of these conditions involved a male and female actor interacting within a social context for approximately twelve-minutes. The only difference that existed between these three tape conditions was the type of interaction that was stressed. For instance, the first condition involved a friendly encounter between the two actors, while the second and third tape conditions stressed an interaction that was more sexually oriented. A two (sex-of-subject) by three (tape condition) experimental design with approximately thirty subjects comprising each cell was used. Each subject was enrolled in a general psychology course and received experimental credit for participation. Only one experimenter was used throughout the experiment since previous research had not detected any subject by experimenter interactions

for similar situations (Abbey, 1982).

Materials

The first aspect of this study consisted of recruiting, rehearsing, and videotaping a set of male and female actors. These actors represented a crucial component of the study in that the ratings obtained from the male and female subjects were contingent upon the extent to which the interactions between the actors were perceived to be natural and realistic. The situation depicted in each tape condition was portrayed as being a chance encounter between two fellow undergraduates who were waiting to meet with their academic advisors. To ensure that a realistic and uninhibited interaction took place, actors who were skilled in interpersonal communications, and who had a general knowledge of the advising process were selected.

A basic premise underlying this study was that subjects would be rating the perceived interaction between a male and female. Since the ratings of the interaction reflected a personal viewpoint on the part of the subjects, it was necessary to establish a common link between the subjects and the actors. Therefore, each of the actors were similar in age to most

undergraduates. The rationale behind this approach was that inferences concerning possible intentions for each sex (eg. proclivity to act on these perceptions) would be made from the ratings of the subjects. Hence, as long as the situation was perceived to be realistic, it was anticipated that male and female subjects would view the actors as peers and rate them accordingly. An effective link was established through the use of an academic setting along with suitably aged actors (eg. 18-24 yrs).

Tape conditions

As previously mentioned, three tape conditions were employed. Each condition consisted of the same actors, situation, and story line, except that the two sexual conditions were manipulated such that they contained a variety of sexual overtones (eg. dialogue and mannerisms). The two sexual conditions were counter-balanced with respect to which sex initiated the sexual contact and dialogue. That is, one condition (MI) had the male initiate all of the sexual contact and dialogue at an appropriate time throughout the conversation. Toward the end of this conversation the male also made the first attempt in asking the female out for a date by exchanging phone numbers with

her. An identical format was emphasized in the second sexual condition (FI) where the female initiated all of the sexual gestures and remarks and eventually ended up exchanging phone numbers with the male.

It should be mentioned that the conversation within each of these conditions was not as one-sided as it might seem. For instance, the actor who was not initiating any of the sexual cues did respond favorably to their counterpart's remarks. In fact, each of these actors was trained not to express any type of reaction that would be construed by the viewers as being negative. Moreover, the sexual contact and dialogue that is being referred to in each of these conditions was more in line with the types of subtle sexual cues that are expressed between two members of the opposite sex that have become "interested" in each other.

The remaining tape condition (friendly) was manipulated to portray an innocuous interaction between members of the opposite sex. The actors in this condition were trained to interact on a superficial level and to avoid any actions that might be construed as being sexual. The topic areas that they discussed were similar to the sexual conditions (eg. classes, social activities, etc) with the obvious exception

being that they did not make any sexual reference toward one another.

The introduction for each scenario was as follows. Subjects were informed that the characters in the videotape were college students who had never met prior to this time, and that they were seeking pre-enrollment advising from their undergraduate advisors. The setting in which this encounter took place was the advisement center for the College of Business Administration. The conversation between the actors varied in terms of content in that they talked about a variety of topics such as classes, social activities, and campus life. Furthermore, the dialogue used for each interaction was similar between tape conditions, except that for the sexual tape condition a more suggestive type of dialogue/interaction was going on between the two actors. As previously mentioned, the actors in these two conditions discussed topic areas that might not have been appropriate for a first time, chance encounter (i.e. looks, physiques, personalities). Explicit, blatant scenes of sexuality were not portrayed, however; since the main focus of this tape condition was to allude to the presence of a sexual interaction, subtle types of cues such as moving

closer to one another, touching one's knees, or exchanging phone numbers were emphasized.

Procedure

Group sizes of approximately fifteen to twenty subjects were run in separate trials in order to allow each subject the opportunity to adequately view the videotape. Subjects were informed that the nature of this study was to investigate the ways in which individuals perceive varying social interactions between members of the opposite sex. In addition, subjects were informed that the study would take approximately forty-five minutes to complete, and that they were free to leave at any time if they experienced stress, anxiety, or discomfort with the study. Each subject was asked to pay strict attention while viewing the twelve-minute videotape involving a male and female actor interacting in a social situation. The tape condition (friendly vs sexual) in which subjects were placed was predetermined through the use of random-assignment procedures.

After viewing one of the tapes, subjects were given a packet of questionnaires and asked to fill them out as completely as possible. They were instructed to rely only on their interpretations of the interaction

they had just witnessed. The packet of questionnaires that each subject was asked to complete included a separate perception questionnaire for each of the actors, along with a general intent survey that asked subjects to rate the "sexual" intentions of both the male and female actors (see Appendix A & B). The perception questionnaires were intended to assess any differences in the way subjects used the relevant terms/phrases to describe the actors. The intent survey was aimed at exploring whether the men and women projected any type of sexual intent upon the actors in the tape condition they viewed. The order in which each subject rated the male and female actors on the perceptions survey was counter-balanced, although the intent survey was the last questionnaire answered. When all of the questionnaires were completed, the experimenter answered any questions the subjects had concerning the experiment. At this time the experimenter thoroughly debriefed the subjects about the nature of the study.

Analyses

Although Johnson, Freshnock, and Saal (1986) examined the internal consistency of the four sexual adjectives and found it to be appropriately high (e.g.,

Cronbach's alpha = .77), the first step in the present study was to factor-analyze the entire rating scale to determine if the four sexual adjectives (sexy, flirtatious, promiscuous, and seductive) were perceived as unitary dimension. Depending on the results, one of two steps followed. It was anticipated that a sexual dimension from the factor analysis would be derived, therefore allowing for scale scores based on unit weights of items loading highly on a dimension to be created. These subscales would serve as dependent measures in a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The advantage of using scale scores is that it reduces the number of variables in the MANOVA, thus making the test more powerful. A powerful analysis would be needed to detect the two-way interaction discussed in hypothesis four.

Since the factor analysis may not produce meaningful dimensions, or the four sexual adjectives may not load on one factor, the individual ratings on each of the adjectives would serve as separate variables in a 2 (sex-of-subject) by 3 (type of condition) MANOVA. In this case, a significant multivariate F would suggest that follow up univariate analyses of variance be performed. The

univariate analyses would determine whether there are significant differences on any of the sexual and non-sexual terms, as well as on the alternative phrases.

The final analyses would involve the use of a repeated-measures approach on the ratings of the male and female actors. A 2 (sex-of-subject) by 3 (type of condition) by 2 (sex-of-actor) factorial, with sex-of-actor being the within-subject factor, could be used for each of the adjectives. It should be noted that this format could have been used in the above mentioned multivariate analyses of variance. However, given that the sex-of-actor effect was not a major focus of the study, and that adding another variable to the MANOVA procedures would decrease their power, the choice of using the repeated-measures univariate procedures to test this particular effect seemed appropriate. The results of these analyses will allow us to determine whether a difference existed between the way men and women used the terms/phrases to describe each of the actors.

Results

Manipulation Check

In order to determine whether each of these tape

conditions was seen as being friendly or sexual, 17 male and 25 female undergraduates served as judges for a manipulation check prior to the actual running of the experiment. Each of the judges was unaware of the experimental manipulation and was randomly assigned to one of the three tape conditions. Judges were instructed to rate on a 7-point Likert scale (1 being a low response, 7 being a high response) the extent to which the tape condition they viewed exhibited friendly, sexual, and realistic characteristics. Judges were also instructed to rate, on the same scale, the level of attractiveness they would attribute to the male and female actors.

Table 1 represents the mean ratings for each of these items. A two (sex-of-subject) by three (type of condition) analysis of variance for each of these items was conducted. As the table indicates, judges saw no difference between the tape conditions with respect to the friendly and realistic characteristics. The mean ratings for each of these characteristics were consistently high, indicating that each of the tape conditions was perceived as being friendly as well as realistic. Judges' mean ratings of the sexual characteristic, however, indicated that a difference

did exist between the three tape conditions ($F(2,35) = 9.63$, $p<.001$). Inspection of these mean ratings indicated that each of the sexual tape conditions (MI & FI) were seen as being significantly more sexual than the friendly tape condition, but that the two sexual tape conditions were not rated significantly different from each other. Furthermore, the sex-of-subject main effect and two-way interaction was not significant, indicating that each sex rated the conditions in a similar manner. Similarly, there were no main effects of condition or sex-of-subject with respect to the attractiveness questions. As the marginal means point out, the male and female actors were rated similarly in terms of attractiveness by both the male and female judges.

Overall, the results of these analyses suggest that the three tape conditions were seen as being realistic and friendly, but that the two sexual conditions were perceived as being more sexual than the friendly tape condition. Furthermore, judges felt that the actors were exhibiting comparable levels of attractiveness across each tape condition.

Preliminary Study

In an attempt to determine whether or not the terms

used in the Abbey (1982), Saal and Freshnock, (1986), and Johnson, Freshnock, and Saal (1986) studies were biased toward a particular sex, Heck (1986) developed a study whereby the sex-of-actor effect could be experimentally examined. Heck hypothesized that the words flirtatious, seductive, promiscuous, and sexy were more readily and naturally applied to women than to men. This finding, if supported, would indicate that the dependent measures (terms) be reevaluated for their appropriateness to detect a perceptual bias between the sexes, since any difference on theses measures may be more an artifact of the bias of term usage rather than a true attitudinal difference.

One hundred and eighteen undergraduates were recruited for this study. Subjects were asked to complete a fifty-five item questionnaire concerning their impressions of either a typical male or a typical female. The questionnaire contained each of the key terms along with alternative choices (see Appendix C). These choices were definitions of the original terms, and it was anticipated that most of them would not be used more readily for a specific sex. Subjects were instructed to rate each term or phrase separately according to how descriptive it was of a typical male

or female. A 7-point rating scale was used, ranging from (1), not being very descriptive, to (7), being very descriptive.

The mean rating of each of the key terms, along with their alternative phrases, is highlighted in Table 2. As can be seen, women were consistently rated higher on each of the key terms than were men. However, the majority of alternative phrases received comparable ratings, indicating that they were equally descriptive of both men and women. Twenty-six separate univariate analyses were performed on the data. To ensure an experimentwise p-level of .05, a protected F of .002 was established. Therefore, only those effects that were less than .002 were considered significant. Those effects that ranged from .05 to .002 were considered marginally significant.

The results of these analyses indicated that there was no sex-of-subject effect for any of the terms or phrases. Therefore, Table 3 represents the mean values for each target person, collapsing over sex-of-subject. In addition, this table indicates a sex of target person effect for each of the key terms, suggesting that usage of each of these terms was biased towards women in general. Only thirty-three percent of the

alternative phrases were found to be statistically significant, indicating that use of these phrases was not biased, and they are perhaps better choices than the key terms. The right-hand column of this table represents the amount of variance explained for each of the significant terms and phrases by the sex-of-actor main effect. As can be seen, the sex of target effects for the key terms account for larger percentages of the variance than those of the alternative phrases or non-relevant items. An interesting contrast that has emerged from the results of this study is that the male target person was rated higher in terms of sexual attributes for each of the significant alternative phrases (see Table 3). These alternative phrases are generally more specific than the key terms. Therefore any difference that exists between the groups may suggest that when specific descriptions of sexual behavior are listed, men tend to be perceived as being more sexual than women.

The results of Heck (1986) suggest that caution should be exercised when interpretating any of the sex-of-actor main effect. Although the studies of Abbey, (1982), Saal and Freshnock, (1986), and Johnson, Freshnock, and Saal, (1986) were not overly concerned

with this effect, the fact remains that women may not be perceived as being more flirtatious, seductive, promiscuous, or sexy than men. The words used to describe them do, however, tend to be used in a biased fashion. Heck's findings lent no evidence to suggest that men's connotations of these words were any different from women's. There was no main effect of sex-of-subject. The studies of Abbey, Saal and Freshnock, and Johnson et al. however, found that men misperceived friendliness cues. Heck supported the notion that men and women subjects were not differentially biased in their use of the key terms.

Reliability Analyses

Throughout this section it should be kept in mind that subjects in this study were instructed to rate the male and female actors separately on the seventy-five adjectives/phrases (see Appendix A). Since separate ratings for the actors were available, the first set of analyses involved the use of a reliability procedure on the relevant terms and phrases used in this study. Specifically, a measure of internal consistency (coefficient alpha) was obtained for each of the actors by conducting separate reliability analyses on the key and non-sexual terms as well as the alternative

phrases.

The results of the reliability analysis for the male actor indicated that the four key terms combined produced a coefficient alpha of .84, while an alpha of .86 was derived for the twelve alternative phrases. For the ten non-sexual terms, the alpha was equal to .82. Similarly, the reliability analysis for the female actor produced an alpha of .89 for the key terms and an alpha of .91 for the alternative phrases. The coefficient alpha derived for the non-sexual terms was .83. These results suggest that the internal consistency for each group of terms/phrases was sufficiently high.

In addition to determining the internal consistency of the various terms and phases, a separate reliability analysis was conducted on the intent survey. The results of this analysis indicated that, as in the case of the terms/phrases, there was a substantial amount of consistency in the way subjects rated the various intentions of the male and female actors (alpha =.82).

Factor Analyses

The rating scales for each of the actors were factor analyzed in order to determine if the four key terms (sexy, flirtatious, promiscuous, and seductive)

were being perceived as a separate dimension in comparison to the remaining non-sexual terms and alternative phrases. Separate principle-axes factor analyses (PAF) were conducted on the male and female actors so that meaningful interpretations of the factors could be made. Each of these analyses incorporated a varimax rotation procedure. Separate analyses were conducted to gain insight into how subjects rated each of the actors. Specifically, the use of separate principle-axes factor analysis procedures could detect whether the structure of the terms and phrases was different for the male actor as opposed to the female actor.

Table 4 depicts the rotated factor matrix for the ratings of the male actor. This table indicates, through the use of a scree test, that for all of the relevant terms/phrases, the principle-axes factor analysis yielded a five-factor solution. The percentage of common variance explained by these five factors combined was 59.1 percent, with factors one and two accounting for more than 43 percent of this variance. The remaining three factors accounted for approximately 15 percent of the total variance.

Similarly, the factor matrix for the ratings of the

female actor is given in Table 5. Again, a five-factor solution emerged from the principle-axes factor analysis. Combined, these five factors accounted for 60.3 percent of the common variance. In this case, the percentage of variance explained by the first two factors was 45.9 percent. Factors three through five accounted for 14.4 percent of the common variance.

Close inspection of Tables 4 and 5 reveals two major findings. First, for each analysis, the four sexual terms did not load consistently on any one specific factor. In fact, for each of the actors, the terms seductive and promiscuous loaded highly on the first factor, while sexy and flirtatious loaded on the third and fourth factors respectively. Furthermore, each of these tables indicate that factor one consisted of predominantly sexual terms, whereas the third and fourth factors were represented by non-sexually oriented terms. Moreover, within each of the matricies, there was a substantial amount of cross-loading between factors. For instance, in Table 4 the third alternative phrases for seductive and flirtatious cross-loaded on factors one and two. Simple structure was not achieved with the varimax procedure, and the results of these analyses would

suggest that the key terms were not being perceived as a unitary dimension by the subjects. In an attempt to determine if the varimax procedure was inappropriate given the nature of the key terms and alternative phrases (i.e., correlations between terms/phrases), seperate PAF analyses were conducted using an oblique rotation procedure. Except for a minimal amount of cross-loading on three of the non-sexual terms, the results of these analyses were virtually identical to those using the varimax procedure. Therefore, the oblique procedure confirmed the original findings of the varimax procedure in that there was no simple structure among the key and non-sexual terms as well as the alternative phrases.

As evidenced by the results of the principle-axes factor analyses, no clearly defined dimensions for the twenty-six adjectives/phrases were derived. Therefore, the development of scale scores was not attempted. Since the structure of these terms/phrases was not as predicted, each served as a separate variable in a series of 2 (sex-of-subjects) by 3 (type of condition) multivariate analyses. For each actor, separate MANOVAs were conducted on the four key terms, twelve alternative phrases, and ten non-sexual terms.

Therefore, each MANOVA comprised a conceptually distinct group of terms/phrases.

Multivariate Analyses of Variance

Table 6 depicts the means and standard deviations for each of the terms/phrases for the male actor. The values listed within the brackets represent the marginal means for the main effects for condition as well as for sex-of-subject. The letters that follow each bracket identify those groups that were significantly different from each other. Different subscripts denote mean differences.

For the male actor, the results of the statistical analyses are as follows. First, the MANOVAs performed on each group of adjectives (i.e., sexual terms, alternative phrases, and non-sexual terms) were unable to detect a significant interaction between the sex-of-subject and condition variables. However, within each of these analyses, significant main effects for the condition and sex-of-subject variables were evident. Table 6A presents a summary of these effects with the appropriate probability levels and effect sizes for each of the terms and phrases. To further explore the nature of these main effects, univariate analyses of variance were performed on each of the

sexual and non-sexual terms and alternative phrases.

The univariate analysis for the four key terms indicated that "sexy" and "flirtatious" produced main effects of condition, whereas "seductive" and "promiscuous" yielded condition and sex-of-subject main effects. For two of these four terms (sexy & flirtatious) both men and women rated the male actor in the initiating conditions as trying to be more sexual than the male actor in the friendly condition. Similarly, men rated this actor as trying to behave more "seductively" and "promiscuously" than did women in each of these conditions. In comparison, four of the twelve alternative phrases exhibited condition and sex-of-subject effects. Again, in each of these situations, the male actor was rated as being more "sexy," "seductive," and "promiscuous" by the men. Finally, for five of the ten non-sexual terms, a condition effect was noted. For these five terms (i.e., friendly, enthusiastic, cheerful, assertive, and caring) the male actor was rated higher in terms of those specific attributes in the male initiating condition than in the female initiating or friendly conditions.

The mean ratings and standard deviations for each

of the terms and phrases for the female actor are presented in Table 7. As mentioned earlier, the values listed in the brackets are marginal means for the sex-of-subject and condition effects. Main effects are distinguished through different subscripts. The series of MANOVAs that were conducted on the grouping of terms/phrases indicated significant main effects for condition and sex-of-subject, however no interaction between these two variables was established. As in the case of the male actor, univariate analyses of variance were performed on each of the main effects. Table 7A illustrates those terms and phrases that yielded statistically significant effects.

Two of the four key terms for the female actor produced both significant condition and sex-of-subject effects. Men viewed the female actor as trying to behave more "seductively" and "promiscuously" than did women. Furthermore, the female actor in both initiating conditions received higher mean rating than the female in the friendly condition. The remaining key terms varied in that they either produced a sex-of-subject effect or a condition main effect. For instance, the term sexy produced a sex-of-subject effect which indicated that higher mean values were

ascribed across all tape conditions to the female actor by the male subjects. Flirtatious, on the other hand, produced a main effect of condition which indicated that the initiating conditions were rated higher in terms of this attribute than the friendly tape condition.

Main effects of condition and sex-of-subject were found among four of the twelve alternative phrases. The female actor in this case was consistently rated higher in terms of "sexiness," "seductiveness," and "flirtatiousness" by the men, and the initiating tape conditions received higher mean values than the friendly condition. Table 7A highlights the sex-of-subject effects which were evident with five other alternative phrases. Men viewed the female actor higher in terms of the alternative phrases for sexy, seductive, promiscuous, and flirtatious than did women.

The non-sexual terms, likable and cheerful, produced condition and sex-of-subject main effects. Men consistently rated the female actor higher on these two terms than did women. Furthermore, men also assigned higher mean values to the female actor in both of the initiating conditions in comparison to the friendly tape condition. There were condition main

effects for the terms enthusiastic, assertive, caring, popular, and pleasant. Here again higher values were assigned to the female actor in the sexual tape conditions.

In addition to the individual analyses on the actors, ten separate univariate analyses of variance were conducted on all the relevant intent survey questions. As mentioned previously, this questionnaire was intended to explore whether men and women projected any type of sexual intent upon each of the actors in the tape condition they viewed. Table 8 presents the means and standard deviations for the ratings on these questions. As this table points out, those questions that asked subjects to rate how interested the actors were in becoming friends, or how attracted the actors were to one another, produced a main effect for condition. Likewise, the questions that asked whether the male or female actor was trying to "pick up" their counterpart also produced condition main effects. Since there was no effect of sex-of-subject, these results would suggest that both the male and female subjects attributed higher mean values to the actors in the sexual conditions as opposed to the friendly condition.

The most intriguing findings with respect to the intent survey were noted in the final three questions. That is, each of these questions was designed to explore whether the subjects formed any specific notions concerning the sexual inclinations of the actors. It should be pointed out that prior to answering any of the sexually oriented questions, subjects were asked to imagine, for the moment, that the actors actually went out on a date. Questions thirteen and fourteen asked subjects if they thought the male and female actor wanted to engage in various sexual activities (e.g., petting, foreplay, and/or sexual intercourse) with his/her date. Question fifteen was even more direct in that it asked subjects to rate how likely it was that these two actors would engage in sexual intercourse on their first date. The subjects' responses indicated a consistent main effect for sex-of-subject and condition. Compared to women, men assigned higher mean ratings to each of these questions. Moreover, there was a higher perceived probability of sexual activity taking place between the two actors in the initiating conditions than in the friendly condition.

Repeated Measures Analyses

The final set of analyses for this study involved the use of a repeated-measures procedure on the overall ratings of the male and female actors. Specifically, twenty-six separate repeated-measures analyses were conducted on the ratings the men and women assigned to each of the actors. As mentioned previously, a 2 (sex-of-subject) by 3 (type of condition) by 2 (sex-of-actor) design was utilized. In order to ensure a family-wise significance level of .05, a protected *F* of .002 was established. Only those terms or phrases for which the p-value was at or below .002 are discussed. Since effects of sex-of-subject and condition have been discussed previously, only sex-of-actor main effects and interactions will receive attention.

The results of the repeated-measures analysis on the four key terms indicated that a main effect for sex-of-actor was found for the terms "sexy" and "seductive." Close inspection of the marginal means in Table 9 shows that the female actor received higher mean ratings on those specific terms than the male actor. A significant condition by actor interaction was detected for the key term "flirtatious." In this

case, the interaction was occurring primarily between the actors in the two sexual conditions. That is, for the friendly and male initiating tape conditions, the male actor received higher mean ratings than the female actor. However, in the female initiating condition, the female actor was rated higher on these sexual attributes than the male actor.

The third alternative phrase for sexy and the second alternative phrase for flirtatious also produced a sex-of-actor main effect. Higher mean ratings were ascribed to the female actor for the sexy alternative phrase, while the male actor received higher mean ratings for the alternative phrase for flirtatious. A condition by actor interaction was noted for the third alternative phrase for seductive. This interaction was similar in nature to the interaction that took place with the key term flirtatious. Specifically, subjects rated the male actor higher in the friendly and male initiating conditions, whereas the female actor received higher mean ratings in the female initiating tape condition.

A sex-of-actor effect was evident in four of the ten non-sexual terms. The female actor was rated as being more "likable," "attractive," and "pleasant" than

the male actor by both men and women. The male actor, however, received a higher mean rating on the "popular" term. A condition by actor interaction was noted for the term assertive. As in the previous interactions, the male actor received higher mean values for the friendly and male initiating conditions, while the female actor was rated higher in the tape condition in which she initiated sexual contact/dialogue.

Although the condition by sex-of-actor interactions represent interesting findings, it should be noted that these interactions were not consistent throughout the analyses. For instance, out of the twenty-six terms/phrase, only three condition by actor interactions were detected. Therefore, caution should be exercised when making any firm statements concerning the generalizability of these interactions.

Discussion

Previous research has established that a consistent and convincing sex difference exists between the person perceptions men and women form while either viewing or participating in a dyadic interaction (Abbey, 1982; Abbey & Melby, 1986; Saal, Johnson, & Freshnock, 1987). Men's perceptions have been found to be more sexual and less friendly than the perceptions that are formed by

women. This perceptual bias has been considered a potentially important component in understanding and explaining a variety of social problems that have involved the implicit or explicit use of sexual aggression against women (e.g., date rape, acquaintance rape and sexual harassment). It has also been demonstrated that the perceptual bias operates in a variety of situational contexts (social, academic, and work), where the type of interaction between members of the opposite sex is depicted as friendly in nature (Abbey, 1982; Saal et al., 1987). These studies, however, have not investigated the perceptions individuals form when exposed to situations where the type of cues were sexually oriented.

The present study attempted to extend this line of research by incorporating sexual overtones into situations where members of the opposite sex are interacting socially. This research was conducted to determine whether a sex difference (bias) would still occur when individuals are presented with subtle sexual cues. It was anticipated that results of this study would tie together the previous findings that men (mis)perceive more sexuality in the behavior of others (Abbey, 1982), and that this (mis)perception would be

carried over into situations where the interactions are sexually oriented (Hendrick, 1975). This finding could then be used to document evidence that in situations where sexual cues are present (e.g., dating situations), men may be inclined to perceive that women are more sexually motivated than they really are. In turn, a clearer understanding concerning the way these perceptions influence overt behavior may be derived.

Before discussing the results of this study, several points of clarification are necessary. First, the generalizations concerning the perceptual biases of men versus women refer to the perceptions each group forms as a whole. Abbey (1982), as well as Saal and his associates (1987), never stated that <u>all</u> men perceive their world in a more sexualized manner than women. They simply suggested that, based on available research, men as a group were more inclined than women to see sexual intent in situations where there were no sexual cues to support their perceptions (i.e., friendly, innocuous interactions). Second, these researchers pointed out that, in all instances, individual differences within the sexes will occur. That is, within any social context, there will be a percentage of men who will view the situations as being

less sexual (similar to a "female" viewpoint) and rate the participants accordingly, while a certain percentage of women will view the same situations as being more sexual (similar to a "male" viewpoint). These individual differences, while expected, do not detract from the basic premise that men are more likely than women to rely on a sexualized frame of reference when making decisions concerning the types of behavior that are displayed in most social situations.

The results of the current study offered support for three of the four major hypotheses. The main effects associated with the three supported hypotheses generally agreed with Abbey's (1982) claim that men attribute more sexuality to social interactions than do women. The first hypothesis tested the premise that the behaviors of the actors would be perceived as being more sexual by men than by women. Specifically, this sex difference implied that men would not only rate the female actor higher in terms of sexual attributes than women, but that they would also rate the male actor higher on these sexual attributes as well. As evidenced by the main effect of sex-of-subject, when men were asked to rate the behavior of the female actor, they viewed her as being more "sexy,"

"seductive," and "promiscuous" than did the female subjects. Likewise, when the men in this study were asked to rate the behavior of the male actor, they once again viewed his behavior as being more "seductive" and "promiscuous" than did their female counterparts. This finding is consistent with much of the previous research which claims that men (as a group) ascribe higher mean values (indicating greater agreement) to these sexual attributes not only for the female actor, but for the male actor as well.

Close inspection of the alternative phrases provided stronger evidence that a similar bias was taking place with the ratings of the male and female actors. Men were more willing to assign higher ratings to a majority of the "sexy," "promiscuous," "seductive," and "flirtatious" phrases than were women. Specifically, men in this study were more comfortable than women with using such phrases as "concerned excessively with sex," "changes sex partners frequently," "likely to entice to sexual intercourse," or "inclined to behave sexually without serious intent" to describe the behavior of both actors. These phrases represent specific definitions of the four key terms, and were incorporated in the design of this study to

determine if they had any bearing on the nature of the perceptual bias. That is, would subjects exhibit a similar perceptual bias when using the alternative phrases to rate the actors' behaviors? The consistency with which this sex-of-subject effect was evident would indicate that, when presented with descriptive, albeit phrases, men are more likely to exhibit a sexually oriented bias when using those phrases than are women.

An obvious generalization that can be extended from these findings is that when the situational context involves either friendly or sexual cues, there is a greater likelihood that men will interpret this behavior as being sexually motivated, whereas women will be less inclined to do so. Much of the literature that has focused on sexual aggression against women (c.f. Brownmiller, 1975; Medea & Thompson, 1975; Stienman, 1980) has argued that in situations where the interpretation of such social cues is critical (e.g., dating, work, etc.), it has been the tendency for men to not only assess the situations as being sexual, but to also act on these perceptions, which has led to a higher incidence of socially unacceptable behaviors (e.g., sexual harassment, date and/or acquaintance rape).

Additional support for this perceptual bias was found in the analyses of the intent survey. When subjects were asked to rate the degree to which either of the actors wanted to engage in various types of sexual activities (question 13 & 14), men rated both actors higher. Moreover, when asked to rate the likelihood of these actors engaging in sexual intercourse on their first date (question 15), men once again perceived a higher probability of this event happening than did women. The primary objective of this intent survey was to detect if men or women were projecting any type of sexual intent on the behavior of the actors. As the results have shown, men, more than women, projected more sexual intent upon the behavior of each actor, regardless of the situational context in which the interaction was presented.

A point of interest regarding the intent survey was that these three questions (13, 14, & 15) were the only questions to produce both sex-of-subject and condition main effects. The remaining questions produced only main effects of condition. A possible explanation for this pattern of results might be that each of these questions contained specific references to the sexual intentions of the actors. The remaining questions were

not as direct as these. Therefore, the directness of the sexually explicit questions may have prompted subjects to rely heavily on the perceptions they formed while viewing the interaction. Since the sex-of-subject main effects for the key terms and alternative phrases have already shown that men were perceiving the interactions as being more sexual, it seems reasonable to assume that these (mis)perceptions may have had a greater impact on the way men responded to the sexual aspects of the intent survey than the way women responded. For each tape condition, when subjects were asked to judge the sexual proclivity of the actors, men perceived the intentions of the actors to be sexually provocative, whereas women were less inclined to ascribe sexuality to those same intentions.

Although a majority of the key terms in the current study produced fairly consistent sex-of-subject main effects, Heck (1986) has questioned the extent to which these terms are the most appropriate means for measuring the sexually-based perceptual bias. Specifically, Heck pointed out that even though the sex-of-subject main effects have been fairly consistent through much of he previous research, the pattern of terms which produced those main effects have not been

as consistent. For instance, men may rate the female actor in one study as being more seductive and flirtatious (Abbey, 1982), but this would not ensure that the same terms would be found to be significant in a replicated study (Abbey & Melby, 1986). In fact, a similar main effect might be exhibited in a follow-up study, but the set of terms that produced that effect may be somewhat different.

Nowhere was this inconsistency more apparent than in the ratings of the male actor. Typically, the ratings of the male actor in the previous research have been less consistent on the key terms than have the ratings of the female actor. In some instances, the ratings of the key terms for the male actor did not differ appreciably between men and women (Abbey & Melby, 1986; Saal, Johnson, & Freshnock, 1987). Although the main effect of sex-of-subject has been persistent throughout much of the research, when asked to rate the male actor, men seemed reluctant to view his behavior as being as sexual as the behavior of the female actor. The failure to obtain a consistent pattern on the ratings of the male actor led Saal et al. to state that they were unable to offer "unqualified" support for Abbey's initial claim that

men perceive their world in more sexual terms than women. Specifically, Saal and his associates argued that the tendency for men to construe a social situation as being overtly sexual is better understood when the behavior of the woman is the focus of attention rather than the behavior of the man.

In order to gain a better perspective on the true nature of these findings, several possible explanations need to be discussed. First, it is possible that the inconsistent pattern of subject main effects were due, in part, to subjects not fully understanding the meanings of each of the key terms. That is, key terms such as promiscuous, flirtatious, and seductive are at best ambiguous. Each of these terms, according to Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (1980), have a variety of different meanings, and there was no way to ensure that all of the subjects interpreted them in a similar fashion. Different interpretations may have affected the way subjects responded to the dependent measures by increasing the amount of variability among subjects, thereby decreasing the ability to detect significant main effects. Support for this explanation can be seen in the results of the current study. The use of alternative phrases seemed to be more effective

than were the key terms. For instance, nine of the twelve possible alternative phrases representing the four key terms produce main effects for sex-of-subject. More importantly, use of these phrases indicated that the male actor's behavior was perceived by men as being similar to that of the female actor's behavior. This finding has not been detected prior to this study, and it seems to suggest that when sexually descriptive phrases are used, men are more willing to recognize and rate the behavior of the male actor as being as sexual as the behavior of the female actor.

Furthermore, since each of the phrases consisted of specific definitions, they were more descriptive, hence less ambiguous than the key terms. At face value this would indicate that the phrases were equal to, if not better than, the key terms in providing information concerning the nature of the subject main effects. Therefore, when subjects were asked to use the key terms and phrases to describe the behavior of each of the actors, the alternative phrases seemed to give them more information with which to make that judgment. The fact that men still rated both actors higher on these alternative phrases suggests even more strongly that men perceive social situations more sexually than do

women.

Another explanation for the inconsistent nature of the subject main effects may be the manner in which the terms are being used to describe each of the actors. For instance, Heck (1986) sought to determine if the key terms used in the past were biased toward one specific sex. Heck had subjects rate what they thought was an "average" male or female. The results of this study showed that the terms used to elicit sexually-based perceptions were more strongly applied to women than to men. This bias, however, was exhibited by both male and female raters. Heck concluded that people in general attribute the terms sexy, seductive, promiscuous, and flirtatious to describe women more than they do to describe men. This would suggest that one of the reasons why there have been less consistent sex-of-subject effects on ratings of the male actor is because the terms used as dependent measures are not readily applied to men as they are to women. The use of alternative phrases instead of key terms has proven to be a better indicator of the perceptions men and women form concerning the behaviors of the male and female actors.

In an attempt to determine if the key terms were

still being used in a biased manner, the second hypothesis of the current study predicted that for each of the tape conditions, the four key terms would be used to describe the behavior of the female actor more so than the male actor. No specific predictions were made regarding the alternative phrases, since past research (Heck, 1986) had indicated that, even though there was a slight tendency for men to receive higher ratings on these phrases, these phrases generally produced less bias than the key terms.

It was thought that a significant sex-of-actor effect would indicate that the key terms were being used in a biased fashion toward the male and female actor. Coupled with a main effect of subject sex, the results concerning this hypothesis would seriously question the findings that have been cited thus far (i.e., men perceiving their world in more sexual terms than women). It is plausible that the ratings of the female actor were more a function of language than perceptual effects. Similarly, men may have been more comfortable with using these terms than were women. Although Heck (1986) found no support for the latter conclusion, he merely had subjects envision what they "perceived" to be an average man or woman. These

findings may have easily changed in a context in which subjects were viewing an actual interaction between members of the opposite sex.

The results of the current study indicated that the sex-of-actor effect was not as strong, nor as convincing as anticipated. Only two of the key terms (sexy & seductive) and two of the alternative phrases (for sexy & flirtatious) produced significant main effects. As predicted, the female actor was rated higher on these traits than the male actor. This effect is consistent with the results of Heck's pilot study (1986), which suggested that people naturally used these terms to describe the women's behaviors more than men's. For the current study, however, the ratings of the majority of terms and phrases were the same for both the male and female actor. This would imply that subjects were not relying on their stereotypes to rate the actors, but on what they thought they actually saw in the interactions. This gives further credence to the assumption tested in this and in previous studies that men's and women's perceptions of social situations may be different, but the stereotypes they rely upon to make judgments about those situations are not. Language usage, however, may

not be as important in detecting the perceptual bias between the sexes as originally anticipated.

Although there was a persistent sex-of-subject effect among the dependent measures, there was also an independent finding that subjects in general attributed more sexuality to the tape conditions that featured sexual cues as opposed to just friendly cues. This finding confirms the prediction of the third hypothesis that subjects would rate the sexual conditions as being more sexy, flirtatious, seductive, and promiscuous than they would rate the friendly tape condition. This hypothesis served primarily as a manipulation check to determine if the tape conditions could be distinguished from each other. Although not explicitly stated, it was thought that this hypothesis would also provide insight into the perceptions men and women form concerning the role of the initiator in each of the sexual conditions. That is, do men and women perceive the situations differently depending upon whether the male or female actor initiates sexual contact? It was anticipated that the actor who initiated the sexual contact/dialogue would be perceived as trying to behave more sexually than the actor who was receiving this attention. The results of this study, however, offered

no support for this expectation. In a majority of cases in which a significant condition effect was found, there was no difference in the ratings of the actors. Subjects perceived the behavior of both actors as being equally provocative across each of the tape conditions.

Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of this finding was that regardless of whether the recipient of a sexual "come-on" was male or female, his or her passive actions were being perceived as intentionally sexual. It appears that, even if an individual exhibits friendly responses but does not encourage these types of advances, they still are having their reactions misconstrued by male and female observers. Would these perceptions change, however, if an individual objected to the sexual advances of his/her counterpart?

A recent study by Johnson, Stockdale, and Saal (1987) attempted to answer this question. Specifically, these researchers created tape conditions which focused on varying levels of sexual harassment within an academic setting. Two of these tape conditions, for instance, portrayed a male and female professor "coming-on" to a student who was of the opposite sex. Since the student's response was a

critical aspect of this study, each of the actors (i.e., students) was instructed to respond to the advances of the professor in either a positive or negative manner. Johnson, et al. anticipated that a positive response by the student would yield higher ratings of the students' sexual intent than would a negative response. The results of their study, however, indicated that the type of response that was exhibited by the students was not as important as originally anticipated. The ratings that the student received on the sexually related criterion variables seemed unaffected by the type of response that was portrayed. Subjects in this study perceived the behavior of the students to be comparable across each tape condition, even though the type of response was markedly different. This finding showed that when a student exhibited an obvious and straightforward disinterest in the possibility of becoming involved with their professor, their behavior still resulted in attributions of sexuality. This was evident even though the professor in the sexually suggestive conditions initiated all of the sexual references.

An interesting comparison can be made regarding the perceptions that were attributed to the student in the

Johnson, et al. (1987) study and the perceptions of rape victims. The ratings of sexual attribution that were projected upon the student may be an indication that the student was, in some way, responsible for the professor trying to "pick him or her up." A similar belief has been noted in much of the literature that deals with the issue of rape (Katz & Mazur, 1979; Russell, 1975). This research indicated that rape victims were frequently held accountable for acts that were perpetrated upon them. Although the degree of perceived accountability varies depending on a variety of situational factors (e.g., sexual proclivity, occupation, etc.), the fact remains that even in situations where the victims have not encouraged the attack, they are often seen as causing their own demise. The research of Johnson, Stockdale, and Saal (1987) would be consistent with this observation, since their findings suggests that even in situations where individuals are trying to avoid an unwanted sexual encounter, they are still perceived as possessing to some degree, sexually oriented motives.

Previous research has used the friendly tape condition to demonstrate that when the interaction between members of the opposite sex is portrayed as

being innocuous, men will generally perceive the situations to be more sexual than women. This finding has been used as a precursor to situations which feature interactions that are somewhat more sexual. That is, in situations such as date/acquaintance rape, there has been an implicit assumption that as the overtones of the interaction become slightly sexual, men perceive these overtones as being a direct invitation to engage in sexual intercourse (Katz & Mazur, 1979; Medea & Thompson, 1975). These distorted perceptions become an obvious problem when men force the act of intercourse upon their companion and feel justified in doing so.

The fourth hypothesis of this study examined the interaction of sex-of-subject with the condition variable. Since two levels of the condition factor portrayed sexual cues, it was hoped that insight would be provided into the processes that take place in similar types of situations (e.g., date and/or acquaintance rape). Specifically, the perceptions men form in these sexual conditions were thought to closely parallel the perceptions formed in a date/acquaintance rape situation in that both involve, to a degree, the distortion of the magnitude of the sexual cues. This

hypothesis predicted that the sex difference that has been reported in much of the previous research would become more pronounced (widen) in the sexually-toned tape condition than in the friendly tape condition. Men were predicted to overestimate the amount of sexuality that was being portrayed in each of the sexual conditions, whereas women were predicted to see slight increases in the amount of sexuality that was present. Although the overall ratings of the male and female subjects would be higher for these two conditions, the difference in the subjects' ratings would be greater in the sexual conditions than in the friendly condition.

The results of this study were unable to support the predictions of hypothesis four. The pattern of these results indicated that while men's ratings increased as the conditions became sexual, so did women's ratings. The ratings of men and women in each of the tape conditions were no greater than the ratings that have been noted in much of the previous research (e.g., Abbey, 1982; Saal & Freshnock, 1986; Johnson, Freshnock, & Saal, 1986). Although not hypothesized, it seems plausible that men's and women's ratings would have increased in magnitude given the obvious nature of

the sexual conditions. That is, with the sexual cues being the major focus of these two conditions, there was less ambiguity about sexuality upon which the ratings were based. Thus women, as well as men, were more likely to detect these higher levels of sexuality and adjust their ratings accordingly. The results, however, did not demonstrate that men's and women's ratings diverge in situations where the sexual cues are more obvious. In fact, the lack of support for the two way interaction, coupled with the sex-of-subject main effects, indicated that the discrepant ratings of men and women (i.e., bias) were as persistent as ever.

Earlier it was noted that the results of this study would bring a clearer understanding of the magnitude of the mean ratings that have been reported in much of the previous research. It was anticipated that the values assigned to the dependent measures in the sexual conditions would contrast with those values assigned to the dependent measures in the friendly condition. Whereas a consistent sex difference has been cited in each of the studies that have featured friendly cues, the magnitude of these ratings have been at or below the midpoint if their respective 7-point scales. These low values suggest that, when men and women were asked

to rate each of the actors, neither perceived the behavior of the actors as being particularly sexual. Although the sexual conditions in the current study incorporated more suggestive cues than the friendly condition, the mean ratings of the actors were comparable across each tape condition. The use of sexual conditions, therefore, was not as beneficial in explaining the nature of the mean ratings as originally anticipated.

Are the low values for the dependent measures an indication that men and women perceive most social situations in a similar manner? Furthermore, is Abbey's initial claim that men perceive their world in more sexual terms somewhat misleading given the magnitude of these mean ratings? The results of the current study, along with the previous research, has indicated that the ratings for each of the actors have proven to be very useful in understanding the processes that take place in most situations. That is, even though the magnitude of these mean ratings were low, the consistency to which they were detected would suggest that a distinct and meaningful sex difference (bias) exists between the perceptions men and women form concerning similar social situations. Moreover,

the sex difference that was detected with the use of the alternative phrases indicates that men are perceiving their world in more sexual terms, since they are more inclined than women to rate the behaviors of both the actors as being sexually oriented, regardless of the situational context. The results of the current study, however, were not able to support one specific finding that was detected in much of the previous research; that is, men consistently rating the friendly behavior of the actors as being less friendly and more sexual than women. Although men did ascribe higher mean values to the sexual attributes, their ratings of the friendly attributes was comparable to the women's ratings.

The current study has primarily focused on the interpretations of the mean ratings that were obtained from the subjects. Perhaps a more in-depth look into the standard deviations of these mean ratings would be beneficial. The standard deviations listed in Table 9 indicate that the variability among the subjects was greater in the sexual conditions than in the friendly condition. Furthermore, the standard deviations obtained from the men in this study was higher than those of the women. These difference would imply that

as the tape conditions became increasingly sexual, individual differences among the sexes became more apparent. That is, when the situations become more clear cut (i.e., sexual conditions), men's ratings varied to a greater extent than did women's ratings. Close inspection of this table, however, revealed that the greater variability was do in part to a larger percentage of men assigning higher mean values to the actors than women. This would suggest that the ratings of men are very much in line with those of women, except that individual differences among a selective portion of men tend to inflate the groups overall mean ratings.

Additional support for the above mentioned interpretations of the mean ratings can be noted in the studies conducted by Saal, Johnson, and Freshnock, (1987). These researchers indicated that when the ratings of the dependent measures are viewed as "threshold" measurements, they may be particularly helpful in providing information concerning men's sexual harassment of women. That is, their findings suggested that when focusing on the friendly behavior of women, men exhibited sexual threshold levels that are noticeably lower than women. Specifically, the

ratings men attributed to the behavior of the female actor (i.e., key terms) were influenced more easily by less overtly sexual cues than were the ratings by the women. In other words, men were more inclined than women to see sexual intent in the actions of the female actor, even though the situational cues did not warrant higher sexual values. According to Saal et al.:

> "as a woman's interpersonal behavior varies along a continuum ranging from very unfriendly and distant to very friendly and outgoing (as it well might, as a woman becomes more familiar with and comfortable in a given social setting), our data suggest that men will be quicker than women to label that increasingly friendly behavior as 'sexy,' and then respond in a variety of ways that the woman in question may construe as sexual harassment (p. 33)".

The results of this study are in agreement with the "threshold" premise extended by Saal and his associates. The mean ratings of the actors in each of the tape conditions indicated that as the situations increased in the amount of sexuality they were portraying, the sexuality ratings of the actors (i.e.,

dependent measures) also increased. Although men and women were more inclined to ascribe higher sexuality ratings to the actors in the sexual conditions, men's ratings of these situations were consistently higher than women's ratings. Therefore, whether the situational context involved friendly and/or sexual cues, the values that were assigned to the dependent measures indicated that the threshold levels of men were noticeably lower than the threshold levels of women.

Overall, the findings from this study provided further support for the hypothesis that men attribute more sexuality to human interactions than do women (Abbey, 1982; Abbey & Melby, 1987; Saal, Johnson, and Freshnock, 1987). Evidence was provided that men, when confronted with a situation that contains friendly and/or sexual cues, are generally more inclined to interpret those cues as being sexually oriented than are women. What has yet to be established, however, is the implications of these findings with regard to date/acquaintance rape as well as sexual harassment. Future research is needed to tie the perceptions that men hold in these situations to their overt behaviors. Furthermore, a relationship needs to be established

between those persons who are known rapists or harassers and their overt actions in order to extend a theory that explains the types of behaviors that are sexually coercive.

References

Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attribution for friendly behavior: Do males misperceive females' friendliness? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 830-838.

Abbey, A., & Melby, C. (1986). The effects of nonverbal cues on gender differences in perceptions of sexual intent. Sex Roles, 15, 283-298.

Brownmiller, S. (1975). Against your will: Men, women and rape. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Byrne, D., & Kelly, K. (1984). Pornography and sex research. In N. Malamuth & E. Donnerstein (Eds.), Pornography and sexual aggression. Florida: Academic Press.

Committee on Obscenity and Pornography (1970). Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Donnerstein, E. (1984). Pornography: Its effect on violence against women. In N. Malamuth & E. Donnerstein, (Eds.), Pornography and sexual aggression. Florida: Academic Press.

Donnerstein, E. (1980). Aggressive erotica and violence against women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 269-277.

Donnerstein, E., & Hallam, J. (1978). The facilitating effects of erotica on aggression toward females. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 1270-1277.

Donnerstein, E., & Linz, D. (1984). Sexual violence in the media: A warning. Psychology Today. 33, 14-15.

Donnerstein, E., & Malamuth, N. (1983). Pornography: Its consequences on the observer. Cited in N. Malamuth & E. Donnerstein (Eds.), Pornography and sexual aggression. Florida: Academic Press.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (1980). Guidelines on Sexual Harassment. Code 29 of Federal Regulations, Part 1604.

Eron, L. D. (1980). Prescription for reduction of aggression. American Psychologist, 35, 244-252.

Eysenck, H. J., & Nias, H. (1978). Sex, violence, and the media. London: Spector.

Gagnon, J. H., & Simon, W. (1973). Sexual conduct. Chicago: Aldine.

Goodchild, J. D., & Zellman, G. L. (1984). Sexual signaling and sexual aggression in adolescent relationships. In N. Malamuth & E. Donnerstein (Eds.), Pornography and sexual aggression. Florida: Academic Press.

Griffitt, W. (1987). Females, males, and sexual responses. In K. Kelly (Ed.), Females, males, and sexuality: Theories and research. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Heck, M. P. (1986). Misperceptions of friendly and sexual cues between males and females: Are the situations truly perceived differently? Paper presented at the annual meeting for Psychological and Educational Research in Kansas, Emporia, KS.

Hendrick, C. A. (1976). Person perception and rape: An experimental approach. Unpublished grant proposal. Kent State University. Cited in Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attribution for friendly behavior: Do males misperceive females' friendliness? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 830-838.

Howitt, D. (1982). Mass media and social problems. New York: Pergamon Press.

Johnson, C. B., Freshnock, N., & Saal, F. E. (1986, August). Friendliness or sexual come-on: A clue to understanding sexual harassment? Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association. Washington, D.C.

Kanin, E. J., & Parcell, R. (1977). Sexual aggression: A second look at the offended female. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 64, 67-76.

Katz, S., & Mazur, M. (1979). Understand the rape victim: A synthesis of research findings. New York: Wiley.

Longino, H. E. (1980). Pornography, oppression, and freedom: A closer look. In L. Lederer (Ed.), Take back the night: Women on pornography. New York: Morrow.

Lederer, L. (1980). Take back the night: Women on pornography. New York: Morrow.

Malamuth, N. (1984). Aggression against women. In N. Malamuth & E. Donnerstein (Eds.), Pornography and sexual aggression. Florida: Academic Press.

Malamuth, N. (1981). Rape fantasies as a function of exposure to violent sexual stimuli. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 10, 33-47.

Malamuth, N., & Check, J. (1981). The effects of mass media exposure on acceptance of violence against women: A field experiment. Journal of Research in Personality, 15, 436-446.

Malamuth, N., & Donnerstein, E. (1982). The effects of aggressive erotic stimuli. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, (vol 15). New York: Academic Press.

Medea, A., & Thompson, K. (1974). Against rape. New York: Farror, Straus & Giroux.

Russell, D. E. (1975). The politics of rape. New York: Stein & Day.

Saal, F. E., & Freshnock, N. (1986, May). Males misperceptions of females friendliness: Replication and extension. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association. Chicago, Illinois.

Saal, F. E., Johnson, C. B., & Freshnock, N. (1987). Friendly or sexy? It may depend on whom you ask. Submitted for publication. Kansas State University. Manhattan, Ks.

Sapolsky, B. (1984). Arousal, affect, and the aggression-moderating effect of erotica. In N. Malamuth & E. Donnerstein, (Eds.), Pornography and

sexual aggression. Florida: Academic Press.

Schaffer, K. F. (1981). Sex roles and human behavior. Massachusetts: Winthrop.

Stienem, G. (1980). Erotica and pornography: A clear and present difference. In L. Lederer (Ed.), Take back the night: Women on pornography. New York: Morrow.

Thomas, M. H., Horton, R. W., Lippencott, E. C., & Drabman, R. S. (1977). Desensitization to portrayals of real-life aggression as a function of exposure to television violence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 450-458.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (1980). Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Co.

Zillman, D. & Bryant, J. (1984). Effects of massive exposure to pornography. In N. Malamuth & E. Donnerstein (Eds.), Pornography and sexual aggression. Florida: Academic Press.

Table 1: Illustrates the cell means for the three components (friendly, sexual, and realistic) and attractiveness ratings of the male and female actors. Marginal means for this manipulation check are listed in the brackets. Significantly different means are denoted by different subscripts.

Rating Scale: 1=(low response)
7=(high response)

		TAPE CONDITION			
		FRIENDLY	SEXUAL(MI)	SEXUAL(FI)	
COMPONENT:	RATER	MEAN (N)	MEAN (N)	MEAN (N)	
FRIENDLY	MALE	5.62 (8)	5.75 (4)	5.80 (5)	[5.70]x
	FEMALE	5.66 (9)	5.90 (10)	5.80 (5)	[5.78]x
		[5.64]a	[5.85]a	[5.80]a	
SEXUAL	MALE	2.12 (8)	3.75 (4)	5.00 (5)	[3.63]x
	FEMALE	1.88 (9)	4.30 (10	4.80 (5)	[3.66]x
		[1.99]a	[4.14]b	[4.90]b	
REALISTIC	MALE	5.62 (8)	6.25 (4)	4.20 (5)	[5.35]x
	FEMALE	5.22 (9)	5.10 (10)	4.40 (5)	[4.99]x
		[5.40]a	[5.42]a	[4.30]a	
ATTRACTIVE (M)	MALE	3.25 (8)	3.25 (4)	4.60 (5)	[3.64]x
	FEMALE	4.05 (9)	4.30 (10)	4.00 (5)	[4.14]x
		[3.67]a	[4.57]a	[4.30]a	
ATTRACTIVE (F)	MALE	3.24 (8)	3.50 (4)	4.40 (5)	[3.64]x
	FEMALE	3.56 (9)	4.60 (10)	3.00 (5)	[3.87]x
		[3.41]a	[4.28]a	[3.70]a	

TABLE 2: Mean ratings of adjectives/phrases on respective target person by male and female subjects. Values indicate the extent to which subjects believed the term was descriptive of that particular target person.

Rating Scale: 7= very descriptive
1= not very descriptive

	MALE RATERS		FEMALE RATERS	
	SEX OF TARGET PERSON			
KEY TERMS:	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
1) Sexy	3.71	5.45	4.70	5.20
2) Seductive	3.75	5.37	3.51	5.60
3) Promiscuous	3.50	5.33	3.70	5.44
4) Flirtatious	3.64	5.37	3.88	5.68
ALTERNATIVE PHRASES:				
SEXY				
1) Concerned excessively with sex.	5.00	3.75	4.48	4.16
2) Erotically stimulating or suggestive.	4.67	5.12	4.59	4.84
3) Radiates sexuality.	4.71	4.95	4.44	4.68
SEDUCTIVE				
1) Likely to entice to sexual intercourse.	5.03	4.37	4.85	3.96
2) Likely to persuade to disobedience or disloyalty.	4.35	3.95	4.00	3.72
3) Persuades or induces to have sexual intercourse.	5.03	4.16	4.48	4.00
PROMISCUOUS				
1) Not very selective in choice of sex partner.	4.14	3.87	4.96	4.04
2) Has more than one sex partner.	4.71	3.87	4.66	4.52
3) Changes sex partners frequently.	4.35	3.54	4.48	3.64

[Table 2 continued]

	MALE RATERS		FEMALE RATERS	
	SEX OF TARGET PERSON			
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
ALTERNATIVE PHRASES (CONT.):				
FLIRTATIOUS				
1) Displays affection without serious intent.	4.03	4.50	4.55	4.56
2) Likely to engage in trifle affairs.	4.57	4.33	4.22	3.60
3) Inclined to behave sexually without serious intent.	4.89	4.12	4.62	4.04
NON-SEXUAL TERMS:				
1) Friendly	4.78	5.62	4.77	5.72
2) Considerate	4.39	5.45	4.55	5.12
3) Warm	4.35	5.12	4.74	4.68
4) Intelligent	5.25	4.91	5.07	5.36
5) Enthusiastic	4.92	4.95	4.62	5.16
6) Cheerful	4.39	5.16	4.25	5.00
7) Sincere	4.35	5.16	4.37	5.04
8) Likable	4.57	5.16	4.11	5.08
9) Attractive	4.75	5.25	5.11	5.08
10)Assertive	5.00	4.54	5.14	4.84

TABLE 3: There was a consistent main effect of sex of target person throughout the data. Therefore, this table represents the marginal means for male and female target persons collapsing over sex of subject.

	TARGET PERSON		OMEGA SQUARE
KEY TERMS:	MALE	FEMALE	
1) Sexy	4.20	5.32 ***	13.5%
2) Seductive	3.63	5.48 ***	28.7%
3) Promiscuous	3.60	5.38 ***	29.9%
4) Flirtatious	3.76	5.52 ***	30.0%
ALTERNATIVE PHRASES:			
SEXY			
1) Concerned excessively with sex.	4.74	3.95 ***	5.7%
2) Erotically stimulating or suggestive.	4.63	4.98 n/s	-----
3) Radiates sexuality.	4.57	4.81 n/s	-----
SEDUCTIVE			
1) Likely to entice to sexual intercourse.	4.94	4.16 **	5.9%
2) Likely to persuade to disobedience or disloyalty.	4.17	3.83 n/s	-----
3) Persuades or induces to have sexual intercourse.	4.75	4.08 **	6.8%
PROMISCUOUS			
1) Not very selective in choice of sex partner.	4.55	3.95 n/s	-----
2) Has more than one sex partner.	4.68	4.19 n/s	-----
3) Changes sex partners frequently.	4.41	3.59 **	7.1%

[Table 3 continued]

ALTERNATIVE PHRASES (CONT.):	TARGET PERSON		OMEGA SQUARE
	MALE	FEMALE	
FLIRTATIOUS			
1) Displays affection without serious intent.	4.29	4.53 n/s	-----
2) Likely to engage in trifle affairs.	4.39	3.96 n/s	-----
3) Inclined to behave sexually without serious intent.	4.75	4.08 n/s	-----
NON-SEXUAL TERMS:			
1) Friendly	4.77	5.62 ***	14.7%
2) Considerate	4.47	5.28 ***	13.0%
3) Warm	4.54	4.90 n/s	-----
4) Intelligent	5.16	5.13 n/s	-----
5) Enthusiastic	4.77	5.05 n/s	-----
6) Cheerful	4.32	5.08 ***	10.7%
7) Sincere	4.36	5.10 ***	11.7%
8) Likable	4.34	5.12 **	7.4%
9) Attractive	4.93	5.16 n/s	-----
10)Assertive	5.07	4.69 n/s	-----

* p <.05
** p <.01
*** p <.001

NOTE: Twenty-six univariate analyses were performed on the data. In order to ensure a family-wise significance level of .05, a protected F of .002 was established. Therefore, only those terms in which the p-levels were at or below .002 were considered significant.

Table 4: Depicts the results of a Principle Axes Factor analysis on each of the key terms, alternative phrases, and the non-relevant terms for the male actor.

ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX:

TERM:	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5
Sexy A2	.806	.125	.105	.053	-.076
Sexy A3	.742	.191	.182	.122	-.101
Seductive	.738	.175	.292	-.027	-.067
Promiscuous	.704	.128	-.105	.075	.246
Sexy A1	.648	.416	-.160	.167	-.021
Seductive A3	.592	.514	.035	.231	-.090
Flirtatious A3	.581	.477	-.067	.182	-.149
Promiscuous A2	.228	.715	.135	-.181	.059
Seductive A2	.175	.658	-.001	-.029	.088
Flirtatious A2	.205	.608	-.050	.298	.088
Promiscuous A3	.431	.591	-.039	.032	-.167
Seductive A1	.538	.546	.073	.188	.031
Attractive	.159	-.044	.795	.155	.127
Sexy	.133	.076	.784	.072	.037
Popular	.093	.191	.731	.104	.080
Likeable	-.122	-.217	.612	.327	.400
Pleasant	-.176	-.124	.520	.254	.426
Enthusistic	.212	-.069	.057	.760	.101
Assertive	.176	.273	.194	.600	.092
Flirtatious	.313	.255	.120	.599	-.128
Cheerful	-.112	.002	.287	.585	.247
Friendly	.007	-.059	.099	.577	.286
Caring	.013	-.146	.249	.182	.678
Flirtatious A1	-.156	.278	.066	.114	.618
Thoughtful	.023	-.253	.319	.260	.547
Promiscuous A1	.371	.293	-.359	-.094	.451

---

* A variamax rotation procedure was used.
** Each of the alternative phrases (A1, A2, & A3) are defined in the glossary section.

Table 5: Depicts the results of a Principle Axes Factor analysis on each of the key terms, alternative phrases, and the non-relevant terms for the female actor.

ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX:

TERM:	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5
Promiscuous A3	.820	-.102	.068	.017	-.032
Seductive A3	.805	-.142	.120	.210	.056
Sexy A1	.798	-.038	.004	.071	.096
Promiscuous A2	.784	-.059	.011	.062	-.070
Seductive A1	.778	-.073	.193	.103	.102
Flirtatious A3	.717	-.014	.035	.192	.243
Flirtatious A2	.685	-.023	.146	.023	.130
Seductive A2	.614	-.330	.148	.195	-.037
Promiscuous	.563	.234	.081	-.220	.308
Seductive	.538	.005	.495	.153	.350
Sexy A2	.497	.021	.373	-.031	.447
Thoughtful	-.007	.788	.029	.030	.043
Caring	-.036	.743	.044	.048	.136
Likeable	-.214	.733	.192	.036	-.085
Pleasant	-.217	.706	.312	.090	-.036
Cheerful	.016	.602	.079	.396	-.149
Friendly	-.061	.469	-.082	.387	.079
Sexy	.207	.086	.818	.085	.102
Attractive	-.001	.285	.743	.150	-.102
Sexy A3	.468	.068	.571	-.011	.349
Popular	.169	.267	.466	.403	-.273
Assertive	.132	.113	.145	.716	.279
Flirtatious	.365	.155	.116	.673	.152
Enthusiastic	.098	.509	.186	.528	-.024
Flirtatious	.055	.101	.087	.305	.581
Promiscuous A1	.395	-.166	-.137	.086	.483

---

* A variamax rotation procedure was used.

** Each of the alternative phrases (A1, A2, & A3) are defined in the glossary section.

Table 6: Represents the means and standard deviations for the ratings of the male actor. Each of the significant main effects that are listed within this table are at or below the $p<.05$ level.

		TAPE CONDITION			
		FRIENDLY	SEXUAL (MI)	SEXUAL (FI)	
KEY TERMS:	RATER	MEAN S.D.	MEAN S.D.	MEAN S.D.	
Sexy	Male:	1.94 (1.06)	2.81 (1.33)	2.44 (1.29)	[2.37]x
	Female:	2.19 (1.41)	2.71 (1.50)	2.96 (1.76)	[2.60]x
		[2.06]a	[2.76]b	[2.71]b	
Seductive	Male:	2.61 (1.84)	3.28 (1.88)	2.37 (1.08)	[2.75]x
	Female:	1.77 (1.17)	2.78 (1.69)	1.81 (1.11)	[2.10]z
		[2.19]a	[3.03]b	[2.07]a	
Promiscuous	Male:	2.80 (1.36)	3.65 (1.15)	3.51 (1.35)	[3.29]x
	Female:	2.19 (1.21)	2.81 (1.53)	3.09 (1.35)	[2.67]z
		[2.49]a	[3.23]b	[3.28]b	
Flirtatious	Male:	3.86 (1.72)	4.78 (1.40)	4.89 (1.87)	[4.47]x
	Female:	3.88 (1.40)	5.68 (1.49)	4.37 (1.51)	[4.61]x
		[3.87]a	[5.23]b	[4.61]c	
ALTERNATIVE PHRASES:					
Sexy A1	Male:	2.58 (1.90)	3.31 (1.71)	3.33 (1.66)	[3.04]x
	Female:	1.66 (1.01)	2.63 (1.72)	2.30 (1.55)	[2.18]z
		[2.12]a	[2.96]b	[2.79]b	
Sexy A2	Male:	2.16 (1.59)	3.09 (1.97)	2.56 (1.56)	[2.75]x
	Female:	1.69 (1.19)	2.66 (1.89)	2.30 (1.57)	[2.20]x
		[1.92]a	[2.87]b	[2.42]ab	
Sexy A3	Male:	2.38 (1.57)	2.81 (1.44)	3.13 (1.45)	[2.75]x
	Female:	1.97 (1.31)	2.60 (1.85)	2.24 (1.27)	[2.26]z
		[2.17]a	[2.70]a	[2.66]a	
Seductive A1	Male:	3.08 (1.93)	4.21 (1.96)	3.70 (1.80)	[3.63]x
	Female:	2.47 (1.42)	3.66 (1.86)	2.96 (1.97)	[3.01]z
		[2.77]a	[3.93]b	[3.31]ab	

[Table 6 continued]

ALTERNATIVE PHRASES:	RATER	TAPE CONDITION: FRIENDLY MEAN S.D.	SEXUAL (MI) MEAN S.D.	SEXUAL (FI) MEAN S.D.	
Seductive A2	Male:	2.63 (1.53)	2.84 (1.46)	2.80 (1.24)	[2.75]x
	Female:	2.11 (1.46)	2.48 (1.37)	2.36 (1.53)	[2.31]z
		[2.37]a	[2.65]a	[2.41]a	
Seductive A3	Male:	2.47 (1.64)	3.46 (1.86)	3.00 (1.68)	[2.95]x
	Female:	1.80 (1.28)	2.57 (1.82)	2.06 (1.56)	[2.13]z
		[2.13]a	[3.00]b	[2.50]ab	
Promiscuous A1	Male:	3.00 (1.78)	3.93 (1.86)	4.16 (1.51)	[3.65]x
	Female:	2.80 (1.84)	3.12 (1.84)	3.63 (1.95)	[3.17]z
		[2.90]a	[3.51]b	[3.88]b	
Promiscuous A2	Male:	2.52 (1.71)	2.46 (1.79)	2.60 (1.75)	[2.52]x
	Female:	2.27 (1.66)	2.24 (1.43)	2.00 (1.43)	[2.17]x
		[2.39]a	[2.34]a	[2.28]a	
Promiscuous A3	Male:	3.02 (1.96)	2.34 (1.51)	2.66 (1.49)	[2.68]x
	Female:	1.69 (1.09)	1.93 (1.27)	2.30 (1.68)	[1.96]z
		[2.35]a	[2.13]a	[2.47]a	
Flirtatious A1	Male:	4.36 (1.55)	4.56 (1.60)	4.80 (1.37)	[4.56]x
	Female:	4.83 (1.79)	4.45 (1.60)	4.54 (1.56)	[4.61]x
		[4.59]a	[4.50]a	[4.66]a	
Flirtatious A2	Male:	3.75 (1.73)	4.09 (1.72)	3.93 (1.57)	[3.91]x
	Female:	2.69 (1.50)	3.45 (2.07)	3.40 (1.62)	[3.97]z
		[3.22]a	[3.76]a	[3.65]a	
Flirtatious A3	Male:	3.16 (1.76)	3.87 (1.62)	3.70 (1.57)	[3.55]x
	Female:	2.02 (1.25)	3.09 (1.75)	2.72 (1.92)	[2.59]z
		[2.59]a	[3.47]a	[3.19]a	

[Table 6 continued]

		TAPE CONDITION					
		FRIENDLY		SEXUAL(MI)		SEXUAL(FI)	
NON-SEXUAL TERMS:							
	RATER	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.
Friendly	Male:	5.56	(1.10)	6.15	(.76)	6.00	(.94) [5.88]x
	Female:	6.13	(.86)	6.39	(.60)	6.00	(.92) [6.17]x
		[5.84]a		[6.27]b		[6.00]ab	
Enthusiastic	Male:	4.69	(1.32)	5.87	(.83)	5.13	(1.00) [5.21]x
	Female:	5.05	(.89)	5.90	(1.18)	5.25	(1.21) [5.39]x
		[4.87]a		[5.88]b		[5.10]a	
Cheerful	Male:	5.16	(1.18)	5.78	(.79)	5.56	(.72) [5.48]x
	Female:	5.55	(.84)	5.97	(.88)	5.68	(.84) [5.72]x
		[5.35]a		[5.87]b		[5.62]ab	
Likeable	Male:	4.91	(1.13)	5.46	(1.13)	5.20	(1.03) [5.17]x
	Female:	5.58	(.99)	5.69	(1.04)	5.53	(1.10) [5.60]x
		[5.24]a		[5.57]a		[5.37]a	
Attractive	Male:	2.86	(1.33)	3.59	(1.31)	3.46	(1.07) [3.28]x
	Female:	3.38	(1.66)	3.78	(1.40)	3.59	(1.58) [2.56]x
		[3.12]a		[3.68]a		[3.52]a	
Assertive	Male:	4.11	(1.36)	4.71	(1.27)	4.48	(1.27) [4.41]x
	Female:	4.08	(1.57)	5.40	(1.58)	3.90	(1.72) [4.43]x
		[4.09]a		[5.05]b		[4.17]a	
Caring	Male:	4.63	(1.09)	5.34	(.92)	4.79	(.97) [4.91]x
	Female:	5.05	(1.19)	5.34	(1.28)	5.21	(1.21) [5.19]x
		[4.84]a		[5.34]b		[5.01]ab	
Popular	Male:	3.50	(1.42)	3.87	(1.38)	3.55	(1.18) [3.63]x
	Female:	3.66	(1.41)	3.87	(1.36)	3.75	(1.27) [3.75]x
		[3.12]a		[3.87]a		[3.65]a	

[Table 6 continued]

		TAPE CONDITION					
		FRIENDLY		SEXUAL(MI)		SEXUAL(FI)	
NON-SEXUAL TERMS (CONT.):							
	RATER	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.
Pleasant	Male:	4.66	(1.09)	5.21	(1.00)	5.27	(.88) [5.02]x
	Female:	5.63	(.99)	5.81	(.93)	5.39	(1.19) [5.60]z
		[5.14]a		[5.51]a		[5.33]a	
Thoughtful	Male:	4.94	(.95)	5.34	(1.12)	4.93	(1.30) [5.06]x
	Female:	5.25	(1.27)	5.68	(1.28)	5.06	(1.36) [5.32]x
		[5.09]a		[5.51]a		[4.49]a	

** The rating scale used for this questionnare ranged from 1 (low) to seven (high).
*** Definitions for the alternative phrases are listed in the glossary section.

Table 6A: Depicts a summary of the main effects of sex of subject and condition for the male actor. Each of these effects were significant at or below the .05 probability level.

EFFECT: Sex of Subject

TERM	PROBABILITY LEVEL	OMEGA SQUARE
-Sexy A3	.022	4.16
-Seductive A2	.032	3.53
-Promiscuous A3	.001	8.76
-Flirtatious A2	.002	7.74
-Flirtatious A3	.001	3.10
-Pleasant	.001	3.06

EFFECT: Condition

-Flirtatious	.001	21.16
-Friendly	.021	4.23
-Enthusiastic	.001	7.55
-Cheerful	.005	6.13
-Assertive	.003	7.03
-Caring	.011	2.33
-Sexy	.006	9.41
-Sexy A2	.004	6.50

EFFECT: Sex of Subject and Condition

-Seductive	.003/.001	12.37/ 6.76
-Promiscuous	.001/.001	3.08/14.92
-Sexy A1	.005/.001	11.70/ 6.70
-Seductive A1	.001/.017	4.60/ 8.20
-Seductive A3	.008/.001	10.26/ 5.50
-Promiscuous A1	.006/.050	2.49/ 6.01

*** Definitions to each of the alternative phrases are listed in the glossary section.

Table 7: Represents the means and standard deviations of the female actors. Each of the significant main effects that are reported within this table are at or below the $p<.05$ level.

		TAPE CONDITION			
		FRIENDLY	SEXUAL (MI)	SEXUAL (FI)	
KEY TERMS:	RATER	MEAN S.D.	MEAN S.D.	MEAN S.D.	
Sexy	Male:	3.52 (1.84)	3.78 (1.62)	3.57 (1.64)	[3.62]x
	Female:	2.44 (1.52)	3.25 (1.65)	2.93 (1.18)	[2.85]z
		[2.98]a	[3.52]a	[3.23]a	
Seductive	Male:	2.83 (1.64)	3.31 (1.63)	3.75 (1.81)	[3.26]x
	Female:	1.80 (1.14)	2.87 (1.74)	2.56 (1.43)	[2.38]z
		[2.32]a	[3.09]b	[3.12]b	
Promiscuous	Male:	3.22 (1.45)	3.84 (1.39)	3.42 (1.52)	[3.49]x
	Female:	2.22 (1.37)	2.61 (1.43)	3.06 (1.31)	[2.61]z
		[2.72]a	[3.23]b	[3.23]b	
Flirtatious	Male:	3.44 (1.61)	4.06 (1.38)	5.14 (1.43)	[4.14]x
	Female:	3.44 (1.62)	5.32 (1.59)	4.93 (1.68)	[4.51]x
		[3.44]a	[4.68]b	[5.03]b	
ALTERNATIVE PHRASES:					
Sexy A1	Male:	2.50 (1.61)	2.62 (1.58)	2.93 (1.74)	[2.62]x
	Female:	1.47 (.90)	1.93 (1.19)	1.78 (1.11)	[1.72]z
		[1.99]a	[2.28]a	[2.33]a	
Sexy A2	Male:	2.55 (1.78)	3.06 (1.56)	3.33 (1.66)	[2.69]x
	Female:	1.77 (1.28)	2.21 (1.57)	2.60 (1.69)	[2.18]x
		[2.16]a	[2.64]ab	[2.95]b	
Sexy A3	Male:	2.88 (1.68)	3.78 (1.31)	3.70 (1.51)	[3.42]x
	Female:	2.05 (1.39)	2.84 (1.43)	2.45 (1.41)	[2.43]z
		[2.47]a	[3.31]b	[3.05]b	
Seductive A1	Male:	3.19 (1.70)	3.59 (1.72)	4.10 (1.88)	[3.59]x
	Female:	1.94 (1.30)	3.06 (1.56)	3.24 (1.88)	[2.72]z
		[2.57]a	[3.32]b	[3.64]b	

[Table 7 continued]

		TAPE CONDITION			
		FRIENDLY	SEXUAL (MI)	SEXUAL (FI)	
ALTERNATIVE PHRASES:					
	RATER	MEAN S.D.	MEAN S.D.	MEAN S.D.	
Seductive A2	Male:	2.55 (1.44)	2.71 (1.44)	3.06 (1.55)	[2.76]x
	Female:	1.91 (1.20)	2.12 (1.57)	2.36 (1.36)	[2.12]z
		[2.23]a	[2.41]a	[2.69]a	
Seductive A3	Male:	2.44 (1.40)	3.06 (1.79)	3.46 (1.69)	[2.95]x
	Female:	1.66 (1.06)	1.96 (1.26)	2.66 (1.65)	[2.08]z
		[2.05]a	[2.50]ab	[3.03]b	
Promiscuous A1	Male:	2.88 (1.78)	3.18 (1.49)	3.70 (1.93)	[3.23]x
	Female:	2.30 (1.67)	3.12 (1.81)	3.21 (1.70)	[2.86]x
		[2.59]a	[3.20]a	[3.44]a	
Promiscuous A2	Male:	2.83 (1.59)	2.75 (1.75)	2.93 (1.94)	[2.83]x
	Female:	1.80 (1.16)	2.06 (1.24)	2.51 (1.73)	[2.11]z
		[2.32]a	[2.41]a	[2.71]a	
Promiscuous A3	Male:	2.86 (1.67)	2.31 (1.17)	2.83 (1.68)	[2.67]x
	Female:	1.50 (.91)	1.84 (1.22)	2.03 (1.33)	[1.78]z
		[2.18]a	[2.08]a	[2.41]a	
Flirtatious A1	Male:	4.52 (1.63)	4.40 (1.58)	4.46 (1.75)	[4.46]x
	Female:	3.63 (1.91)	4.69 (1.57)	5.03 (1.26)	[4.43]x
		[4.08]a	[4.55]ab	[4.76]b	
Flirtatious A2	Male:	3.47 (1.53)	3.84 (1.72)	3.41 (1.54)	[3.57]x
	Female:	2.08 (1.20)	2.90 (1.42)	3.06 (1.67)	[2.66]z
		[2.78]a	[3.36]a	[3.22]a	
Flirtatious A3	Male:	2.86 (1.77)	3.43 (1.81)	3.33 (1.66)	[3.19]x
	Female:	1.80 (1.26)	2.66 (1.42)	3.57 (2.17)	[2.65]z
		[2.33]a	[3.04]b	[3.46]b	

[Table 7 continued]

		TAPE CONDITION			
		FRIENDLY	SEXUAL(MI)	SEXUAL(FI)	
NON-SEXUAL TERMS:					
	RATER	MEAN S.D.	MEAN S.D.	MEAN S.D.	
Friendly	Male:	5.44 (1.08)	6.21 (.79)	5.96 (.92)	[5.85]x
	Female:	5.66 (1.09)	5.72 (1.03)	5.58 (1.12)	[5.65]x
		[5.55]a	[5.97]a	[5.76]a	
Enthusiastic	Male:	4.69 (1.03)	5.59 (1.07)	5.63 (.71)	[5.27]x
	Female:	5.05 (1.19)	5.54 (1.14)	5.51 (1.30)	[5.36]x
		[4.87]a	[5.56]b	[5.57]b	
Cheerful	Male:	5.19 (1.06)	5.75 (.71)	5.56 (.93)	[5.89]x
	Female:	5.58 (.93)	5.90 (.87)	5.78 (1.08)	[5.75]z
		[5.39]a	[5.82]b	[5.67]ab	
Likeable	Male:	5.33 (.92)	5.84 (.88)	5.46 (1.07)	[5.54]x
	Female:	5.77 (.86)	6.03 (.91)	5.36 (1.05)	[5.72]x
		[5.55]a	[5.94]b	[5.41]a	
Attractive	Male:	4.00 (1.24)	4.28 (1.42)	4.20 (1.51)	[4.15]x
	Female:	3.83 (1.46)	4.45 (1.37)	3.87 (1.31)	[4.04]x
		[3.94]a	[4.37]a	[4.03]a	
Assertive	Male:	3.77 (1.12)	4.37 (1.21)	4.73 (1.36)	[4.26]x
	Female:	3.69 (1.60)	4.78 (1.21)	4.75 (1.67)	[4.39]x
		[3.73]a	[4.58]b	[4.74]b	
Caring	Male:	4.63 (1.12)	5.37 (.97)	4.70 (1.26)	[4.89]x
	Female:	5.02 (1.20)	5.45 (1.06)	5.12 (1.24)	[5.19]x
		[4.83]a	[5.41]b	[4.92]a	
Popular	Male:	3.83 (1.34)	4.31 (1.28)	4.46 (1.16)	[4.18]x
	Female:	3.97 (1.66)	4.33 (1.38)	4.51 (1.58)	[4.26]x
		[3.90]a	[4.32]ab	[4.49]b	

[Table 7 continued]

		TAPE CONDITION			
		FRIENDLY	SEXUAL(MI)	SEXUAL(FI)	
NON-SEXUAL TERMS:					
	RATER	MEAN S.D.	MEAN S.D.	MEAN S.D.	
Pleasant	Male:	5.33 (.82)	5.75 (.98)	5.33 (.80)	[5.47]x
	Female:	5.50 (.97)	6.06 (.82)	5.42 (.90)	[5.66]x
		[5.42]a	[5.91]b	[5.38]a	
Thoughtful	Male:	4.80 (1.32)	5.31 (1.03)	5.23 (1.19)	[5.10]x
	Female:	5.13 (1.41)	5.51 (1.17)	5.12 (1.34)	[5.25]x
		[4.97]a	[5.41]a	[5.17]a	

** The rating scale used for this questionnaire ranged from 1 (low response) to 7 (high response).

Table 7A: Depicts a summary of the main effects of sex of subject and condition for the female actor. Each of these effects were significant at or below the probability level of .05.

EFFECT: Sex of Subject

TERM	PROBABILITY LEVEL	OMEGA SQUARE
-Sexy	.001	9.41
-Sexy A1	.001	18.01
-Seductive A2	.002	8.08
-Promiscuous A2	.002	8.39
-Promiscuous A3	.001	16.88
-Flirtatious A2	.001	14.36

EFFECT: Condition

-Flirtatious	.001	21.16
-Flirtatious A1	.028	2.56
-Enthusiastic	.001	10.91
-Assertive	.001	12.53
-Caring	.008	5.59
-Popular	.047	8.49
-Pleasant	.001	1.62
-Likable	.006	6.03

EFFECT: Sex of Subject and Condition

-Seductive	.001/.003	6.76/12.37
-Sexy A2	.015/.001	3.19/ 9.48
-Sexy A3	.003/.001	4.72/17.87
-Seductive A1	.001/.001	5.84/10.39
-Seductive A3	.001/.001	5.94/13.18
-Flirtatious A3	.001/.031	6.19/ 3.60
-Cheerful	.020/.049	4.07/ 2.82
-Promiscuous	.001/.046	3.08/14.92

*** Definitions to each of the alternative phrases are listed in the glossary section.

Table 8: Depicts the mean ratings and standard deviations for the relevant questions of the intent survey. The values listed within the brackets [ ] represent the marginal means for each tape condition as well as sex of rater. Significantly differeent means are denoted by different subscripts.

Rating Scale: 1= Low Respnose
7= High Response

		TAPE CONDITION					
		FRIENDLY		SEXUAL (MI)		SEXUAL (FI)	
QUESTIONS:	RATER	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.
ISQ #1	Male:	5.38	(.80)	6.40	(.79)	6.13	(1.00) [5.94]x
	Female:	5.80	(.92)	6.57	(.61)	6.21	(1.02) [6.18]x
		[5.59]a		[6.48]b		[6.17]b	
ISQ #2	Male:	4.36	(1.17)	5.46	(.94)	4.93	(1.46) [4.89]x
	Female:	4.77	(1.12)	5.45	(1.09)	5.18	(.88) [5.12]x
		[4.56]a		[5.45]b		[5.05]c	
ISQ #5	Male:	1.94	(1.09)	3.78	(1.43)	4.00	(1.72) [3.19]x
	Female:	2.05	(1.28)	3.39	(1.63)	3.78	(1.59) [3.04]x
		[1.99]a		[3.58]b		[3.89]b	
ISQ #6	Male:	4.08	(1.62)	5.87	(1.00)	5.60	(1.32) [5.14]x
	Female:	3.52	(1.61)	5.63	(1.34)	5.30	(1.44) [4.77]x
		[3.80]a		[5.75]b		[5.45]b	
ISQ #8	Male:	3.36	(1.07)	5.18	(1.06)	5.26	(1.11) [4.55]x
	Female:	3.41	(1.07)	4.93	(1.27)	5.06	(1.27) [4.43]x
		[3.38]a		[5.05]b		[5.16]b	

QUESTION:

ISQ #1- How interested was the male student in becoming friends with the female student?
ISQ #2- How interested was the female student in becoming friends with the male student?
ISQ #5- During the interaction, was the female trying to "pick up" the male student?
ISQ #6- During the inteaction, was the male student trying to "pick up" the female student?
ISQ #8- Would you say that the two students were mutually attracted towards one another?

[Table 8 continued]

		TAPE CONDITION			
		FRIENDLY	SEXUAL (MI)	SEXUAL (FI)	
QUESTIONS:	RATER	MEAN S.D.	MEAN S.D.	MEAN S.D.	
ISQ #10	Male:	4.11 (1.46)	5.31 (1.51)	4.83 (1.57)	[4.72]x
	Female:	3.97 (1.44)	5.45 (1.64)	4.21 (1.45)	[4.52]x
		[4.04]a	[5.38]b	[4.52]a	
ISQ #11	Male:	2.80 (1.47)	4.00 (1.62)	4.90 (1.42)	[3.86]x
	Female:	2.86 (1.33)	3.93 (1.73)	4.90 (1.15)	[3.86]x
		[2.83]a	[3.96]b	[4.90]c	
ISQ #13	Male:	3.16 (1.55)	4.50 (1.52)	4.23 (1.43)	[3.93]x
	Female:	2.25 (1.25)	3.63 (1.38)	3.66 (1.45)	[3.15]z
		[2.70]a	[4.06]b	[3.94]b	
ISQ #14	Male:	4.72 (1.66)	5.53 (1.48)	5.70 (1.48)	[5.28]x
	Female:	3.63 (1.86)	4.84 (1.34)	4.24 (1.56)	[4.21]z
		[4.17]a	[5.18]b	[4.97]b	
ISQ #15	Male:	1.83 (1.46)	3.00 (1.86)	2.90 (1.58)	[2.55]x
	Female:	1.58 (1.22)	2.03 (1.33)	2.20 (1.48)	[1.92]z
		[1.70]a	[2.51]b	[2.55]b	

QUESTION:

ISQ #10- How likely do you think the male student will take the initiative, and invite the female student over to his place afterwards?
ISQ #11- How likely do you think the female student will thake the initiative, and invite the male student over to her place afterwards?
ISQ #13- Do you think the female student would like to engage in various types of sexual activities (eg. petting, foreplay, and/or sexual intercourse with her date?
ISQ #14- Do you think the male student would like to engage in various types of sexual activities (eg. petting, foreplay, and/or sexual intercourse with his date?
ISQ #15- How likely do you think it is that these two students will engage in sexual intercourse on their first date?

Table 9: Represents the means and standard deviations of ratings of the male and female actors. The values listed in the brackets [] are the marginal means for the Sex of Actor. Each of the significant effects are reported at or below the .002 p-level.

		TAPE CONDITION					
		FRIENDLY		SEXUAL (MI)		SEXUAL (FI)	
		ACTOR		ACTOR		ACTOR	
		MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
KEY TERMS:	RATER:						
Sexy	Male:	1.94	3.52	2.81	3.78	2.44	3.57
	Female:	2.19	2.44	2.71	3.25	2.96	2.93
		Male: [2.50]		Female: [3.24]			
Seductive	Male:	2.61	2.83	3.28	3.31	2.37	3.75
	Female:	1.77	1.80	2.78	2.87	1.81	2.56
		Male: [2.43]		Female: [2.85]			
Promiscuous	Male:	2.80	3.22	3.65	3.84	3.51	3.42
	Female:	2.19	2.22	2.81	2.61	3.09	3.06
		Male: [3.00]		Female: [3.06]			
Flirtatious	Male:	3.86	3.44	4.78	4.06	4.89	5.14
	Female:	3.88	3.44	5.68	5.32	4.37	4.93
		Male: [4.57]		Female: [4.38]			
ALTERNATIVE PHRASES:							
Sexy A1	Male:	2.58	2.50	3.31	2.62	3.33	2.93
	Female:	1.66	1.47	2.63	1.93	2.30	1.78
		Male : [2.63]		Female: [2.40]			
Sexy A2	Male:	2.16	2.55	3.09	3.06	2.56	3.33
	Female:	1.69	1.77	2.66	2.21	2.30	2.60
		Male: [2.41]		Female: [2.48]			
Sexy A3	Male:	2.38	2.88	2.81	3.78	3.13	3.70
	Female:	1.97	2.05	2.60	2.84	2.24	2.45
		Male: [2.52]		Female: [2.95]			
Seductive A1	Male:	3.08	3.19	4.21	3.59	3.70	4.10
	Female:	2.47	1.94	3.66	3.06	2.96	3.24
		Male: [3.34]		Female: [3.18]			

[Table 9 continued]

		TAPE CONDITION					
		FRIENDLY		SEXUAL (MI)		SEXUAL (FI)	
		ACTOR		ACTOR		ACTOR	
		MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
ALT. PHRASES:	RATER:						
Seductive A2	Male:	2.63	2.55	2.84	2.71	2.80	3.06
	Female:	2.11	1.91	2.48	2.12	2.36	2.36
			Male: [2.14]		Female: [2.45]		
Seductive A3	Male:	2.47	2.44	3.46	3.06	3.00	3.46
	Female:	1.80	1.66	2.57	1.96	2.06	2.66
			Male: [2.56]		Female: [2.54]		
Promiscuous A1	Male:	3.00	2.88	3.93	3.18	4.16	3.70
	Female:	2.80	2.30	3.12	3.12	3.63	3.21
			Male: [3.44]		Female: [3.06]		
Promiscuous A2	Male:	2.52	2.83	2.46	2.75	2.60	2.93
	Female:	2.27	1.80	2.24	2.06	2.00	2.51
			Male: [2.34]		Female: [2.48]		
Promiscuous A3	Male:	3.02	2.86	2.34	2.31	2.66	2.83
	Female:	1.69	1.50	1.93	1.84	2.30	2.03
			Male: [2.32]		Female: [2.22]		
Flirtatious A1	Male:	4.36	4.52	4.56	4.40	4.80	4.46
	Female:	4.83	3.63	4.45	4.69	4.54	5.03
			Male: [4.59]		Female: [4.45]		
Flirtatious A2	Male:	3.75	3.47	4.09	3.84	3.93	3.41
	Female:	2.69	2.08	3.45	2.90	3.40	3.06
			Male: [3.55]		Female: [3.12]		
Flirtatious A3	Male:	3.16	2.86	3.87	3.43	3.70	3.33
	Female:	2.02	1.80	3.09	2.66	2.72	3.57
			Male: [3.09]		Female: [2.94]		
NON-SEXUAL TERMS:							
Friendly	Male:	5.56	5.44	6.15	6.21	6.00	5.96
	Female:	6.13	5.66	6.39	5.72	6.00	5.58
			Male: [6.03]		Female: [5.76]		

[Table 9 continued]

		TAPE CONDITION					
		FRIENDLY		SEXUAL(MI)		SEXUAL(FI)	
		ACTOR		ACTOR		ACTOR	
NON-SEX. TERMS:	RATER:	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
Enthusiastic	Male:	4.69	4.69	5.87	5.59	5.13	5.63
	Female:	5.05	5.50	5.90	5.54	5.25	5.51
		Male: [5.31]		Female: [5.41]			
Cheerful	Male:	5.16	5.19	5.78	5.75	5.56	5.56
	Female:	5.55	5.58	5.97	5.90	5.68	5.78
		Male: [5.61]		Female: [5.62]			
Likeable	Male:	4.91	5.33	5.46	5.84	5.20	5.46
	Female:	5.58	5.77	5.69	6.03	5.53	5.36
		Male: [5.39]		Female: [5.63]			
Attractive	Male:	2.86	4.00	3.59	4.28	3.46	4.20
	Female:	3.38	3.83	3.78	4.45	3.59	3.87
		Male: [3.44]		Female: [4.10]			
Assertive	Male:	4.11	3.77	4.71	4.37	4.48	4.73
	Female:	4.08	3.69	5.40	4.78	3.90	4.75
		Male: [4.44]		Female: [4.34]			
Caring	Male:	4.63	4.63	5.34	5.37	4.79	4.70
	Female:	5.05	5.02	5.34	5.45	5.21	5.12
		Male: [5.06]		Female: [5.04]			
Popular	Male:	3.50	3.83	3.87	4.31	3.55	4.46
	Female:	3.66	3.97	3.87	4.33	3.75	4.51
		Male: [3.70]		Female: [3.48]			
Pleasant	Male:	4.66	5.33	5.21	5.75	5.27	5.33
	Female:	5.63	5.50	5.81	6.06	5.39	5.42
		Male: [5.32]		Female: [5.56]			
Thoughtful	Male:	4.94	4.80	5.34	5.31	4.93	5.23
	Female:	5.25	5.13	5.68	5.51	5.06	5.12
		Male: [5.20]		Female: [5.18]			

** The rating scale used for this questionnaire ranged from 1 (low response) to 7 (high response).
***Definitions for the alternative phrases are listedd in the glossary section.

Appendix A

INSTRUCTIONS: The following items are an attempt to measure the extent to which the various adjectives/phrases listed below can be used to describe the attributes of the male actor in the videotape. The answers to each of the statements reflect your personal opinion and may vary from those of your peers. Keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers.

Using the numbers 1 to 7 on the rating scale given below, mark your personal opinion about each statement in the blank that immediately precedes it. Remember, give your personal opinion according to how descriptive each individual term or phrase is for the male actor.

*** Please try to respond to all items ***

Rating Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not very descriptive			neutral			very descriptive

_____ 1) Friendly

_____ 2) Passive

_____ 3) Shows warm regard.

_____ 4) Immoral

_____ 5) Not very selective in choice of sex partner.

_____ 6) Self confident

_____ 7) Worthy

_____ 8) Tends to inspire a liking behavior.

_____ 9) Modest

_____10) Displays affection without serious intent.

_____11) Caring

_____12) Adjusted

_____13) Inclined not to be hostile.

[Appendix A Cont.]

Rating Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not very descriptive			neutral			very descriptive

_____14) Considerate

_____15) Has more than one sex partner

_____16) Enthusiastic

_____17) Warm

_____18) Demonstrates creative characteristics.

_____19) Likely to entice to sexual intercourse.

_____20) Affectionate

_____21) Intelligent

_____22) Thoughtful of the rights and feelings of others.

_____23) Sexy

_____24) Likely to persuade to disobedience or disloyalty.

_____25) Interesting

_____26) Exhibits a high activity state.

_____27) Inventive

_____28) Lustful

_____29) Courageous

_____30) Concerned excessively with sex.

_____31) Nice

_____32) Frail

_____33) Cheerful

_____34) Likely to engage in trifle affairs.

_____35) Sincere

[Appendix A cont.]

Rating Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not very descriptive			neutral			very descriptive

_____36) Likeable

_____37) Romantic

_____38) Popular

_____39) Seductive

_____40) Sad

_____41) Erotically stimulating or suggestive.

_____42) Shows signs of physical weakness.

_____43) Tends to avoid other people.

_____44) Attractive

_____45) Promiscuous

_____46) Pleasant

_____47) Radiates sexuality.

_____48) Lecherous

_____49) Shy

_____50) Changes sex partners frequently.

_____51) Displays caring qualities.

_____52) Humorous

_____53) Flirtatious

_____54) Exciting

_____55) Persuades or induces to have sexual intercourse.

_____56) Assertive

_____57) Inclined to behave sexually without serious intent.

[Appendix A cont.]

Rating Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not very descriptive			neutral			very descriptive

_____58) Understanding

_____59) Inhibited

_____60) Discourages spontaneous activity

_____61) Exhibits a strong excitement of feeling

_____62) Passionate

_____63) Thoughtful

_____64) Shows kindly interest and goodwill.

_____65) Determined

_____66) Changes moods frequently.

_____67) Stimulating

_____68) Worrisome

_____69) Forgetful

_____70) Generous

_____71) Angry

_____72) Predictable

_____73) Inquisitive

_____74) Eloquent

_____75) Patient

***Indicate your sex: _____Male _____Female

Appendix B

INSTRUCTIONS: The following items are designed to measure the intent of the male and female students in regard to the possibility of developing their relationship. Using the rating scales below, circle your response to each of the questions. Again, the answers to each of the questions reflects your personal opinion, and they may vary from those of your peers. There are no right or wrong answers.

1) How interested was the male student in becoming friends with the female student?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all interested			not sure			very interested

2) How interested was the female student in becoming friends with the male student?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all interested			not sure			very interested

3) To what extent did the female student contribute to the overall development of the conversation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all			average			very much

4) To what extent did the male student contribute to the overall development of the conversation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all			average			very much

5) During the interaction, was the female student trying to "pick up" the male student?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
no, not at all			somewhat			yes, very much so

6) During the interaction, was the male student trying to "pick up" the female student?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
no, not at all			somewhat			yes, very much so

[Appendix B cont.]

7) Do you think the students felt uncomfortable in the situation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
no, not at all			somewhat			yes, very much so

8) Would you say that the two students were mutually attracted towards one another?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
no, not at all			somewhat			yes, very much so

*** Assume for the moment that the male and female students have made a date to go out for dinner and a movie.

9) In order for this date to be a complete success, how important should their conversation be?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not very important			somewhat			very important

10) How likely do you think the male student will take the initiative, and invite the female student over to his place afterwards?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not very likely			unsure			very likely

11) How likely do you think the female student will take the initiative, and invite the male student over to her place afterwards?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not very likely			unsure			very likely

[Appendix B cont.

]

12) In this type of situation, how likely is it that the students will try to express their romantic feelings towards each other?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not very likely			unsure			very likely

13) Do you think the female student would like to engage in various types of sexual activities (eg. petting, foreplay, and/or sexual intercourse) with her date?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
no, not at all			unsure			yes, very much so

14) Do you think the male student would like to engage in various types of sexual activities (eg. petting, foreplay, and/or sexual intercourse) with his date?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
no, not at all			unsure			yes, very much so

15) How likely do think it is that these two students will engage in sexual intercourse on their first date?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not very likely			unsure			very likely

Appendix C

INSTRUCTIONS: The following items are an attempt to measure the extent to which the various adjectives/phrases listed below can be used to describe selected target people. The answers to each of the statements reflect your personal opinion and may vary from those of your peers. Keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers.

Using the numbers 1 to 7 on the rating scale given below, mark your personal opinion about each statement in the blank that immediately precedes it. Remember, give your personal opinion according to how descriptive each individual term or phrase is for a typical male.

*** Please try to respond to all items ***

Rating Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not very descriptive			neutral			very descriptive

_____ 1) Friendly

_____ 2) Passive

_____ 3) Immoral

_____ 4) Not very selective in choice of sex partner.

_____ 5) Self confident

_____ 6) Worthy

_____ 7) Modest

_____ 8) Displays affection without serious intent.

_____ 9) Caring

_____10) Adjusted

_____11) Considerate

_____12) Has more than one sex partner.

_____13) Warm

[Appendix C cont.]

Rating Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not very descriptive			neutral			very descriptive

_____14) Sexy

_____15) Intelligent

_____16) Enthusiastic

_____17) Likely to entice to sexual intercourse.

_____18) Affectionate

_____19) Likely to persuade to disobedience or disloyalty.

_____20) Interesting

_____21) Inventive

_____22) Lustful

_____23) Courageous

_____24) Concerned excessively with sex.

_____25) Nice

_____26) Frail

_____27) Cheerful

_____28) Likely to engage in trifle affairs.

_____29) Sincere

_____30) Likeable

_____31) Romantic

_____32) Popular

_____33) Seductive

_____34) Sad

_____35) Erotically stimulating or suggestive.

[Appendix C cont.]

Rating Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not very descriptive			neutral			very descriptive

_____36) Attractive

_____37) Promiscuous

_____38) Pleasant

_____39) Radiates sexuality

_____40) Lecherous

_____41) Shy

_____42) Changes sex partners frequently.

_____43) Humorous

_____44) Flirtatious

_____45) Exciting

_____46) Persuades or induces to have sexual intercourse.

_____47) Assertive

_____48) Inclined to behave sexually without serious intent.

_____49) Understanding

_____50) Inhibited

_____51) Passionate

_____52) Thoughtful

_____53) Determined

_____54) Changes moods frequently.

_____55) Stimulating

***Indicate your sex: _____Male _____Female

GLOSSARY SECTION: Represents the definitions for each of the alternative phrases used in this study.

ALTERNATIVE PHRASE	DEFINITION
-Sexy A1	-Concerned excessively with sex.
-Sexy A2	-Erotically stimulating or suggestive.
-Sexy A3	-Radiates sexuality.
-Seductive A1	-Likely to entice to sexual intercourse.
-Seductive A2	-Likely to persuade to disobedience or disloyalty.
-Seductive A3	-Persuades or induces to have sexual intercourse.
-Promiscuous A1	-Not very selective in choice of sex partner.
-Promiscuous A2	-Has more than one sex partner.
-Promiscuous A3	-Changes sex partners frequently.
-Flirtatious A1	-Displays affection without serious intent.
-Flirtatious A2	-Likely to engage in trifle affairs.
-Flirtatious A3	-Inclined to behave sexually without serious intent.

MISPERCEPTIONS OF FRIENDLY AND SEXUAL CUES: THE EFFECTS OF GENDER AND SITUATION

by

Michael P. Heck

B.S., Frostburg State College, 1983

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Psychology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1987

ABSTRACT

Previous research has established that a consistent and convincing sex difference exists between the person perceptions men and women form while viewing or participating in a dyadic interaction. Specifically, it has been noted that in friendly, innocuous situations, men's perceptions have been found to be more sexual and less friendly than the perceptions that are formed by women. This sex difference has been referred to as a perceptual bias and has been considered a potentially important component in understanding and explaining a variety of social problems that have involved the implicit or explicit use of sexual aggression against women. These situations include, but are not limited to, date rape, acquaintance rape, and sexual harassement. Although much of the previous research has demonstrated that the perceptual bias operates in a variety of situational contexts (social, academic, and work), it has not established whether the same bias would occur in situations that feature sexually oriented cues/behaviors.

The focus of the present study was to extend this line of research by incorporating sexual overtones into situations where members of the opposite sex were interacting socially. It was anticipated that the results of this study would document that men (mis)perceive more sexuality in the behaviors of others, and, that this (mis)perception would be carried over into situations where the interactions are sexually oriented. By establishing a pattern in the way men view various social situations, a clearer understanding concerning the way these perceptions influence their overt behavior may be derived.

Overall, the findings from this study were able to provide further support for the hypothesis that men attribute more sexuality to human interactions than do women. Specifically, evidence was provided that men, when confronted with a situation that contains friendly and/or sexual cues, are generally more inclined than women to interpret those cues as a sign of sexual interest. The implications of these findings are discussed within the context of sexual aggressive acts that are perpetrated against women.

Future research, however, is needed to establish a relationship between those persons who are known

rapists or harassers and their overt behaviors in order to extend a theory that explains the types of behaviors that are sexually coercive.